

SOME THEORETICAL RESULTS ON NEURAL SPIKE TRAIN PROBABILITY MODELS ¹

BY HOCK PENG CHAN AND WEI-LIEM LOH

National University of Singapore

This article contains two main theoretical results on neural spike train models. The first assumes that the spike train is modeled as a counting or point process on the real line where the conditional intensity function is a product of a free firing rate function s , which depends only on the stimulus, and a recovery function r , which depends only on the time since the last spike. If s and r belong to a q -smooth class of functions, it is proved that sieve maximum likelihood estimators for s and r achieve essentially the optimal convergence rate (except for a logarithmic factor) under L_1 loss.

The second part of this article considers template matching of multiple spike trains. P -values for the occurrences of a given template or pattern in a set of spike trains are computed using a general scoring system. By identifying the pattern with an experimental stimulus, multiple spike trains can be deciphered to provide useful information.

1 Introduction

In the field of neuroscience, it is generally acknowledged that neurons are the basic units of information processing in the brain. They do this by generating characteristic very short duration and highly peaked electric action potentials, or more simply spikes, in its body [see, for example, Dayan and Abbott (2001)]. These spikes can travel along nerve fibers that extend over relatively long distances to other cells. The temporal pattern of these spikes depends dynamically on the stimuli of the neuron or the biochemicals induced by the spikes of other neurons. The collection of such spikes generated by a neuron over a time period is called a spike train. In this way, information is transmitted via spike trains. Because the spikes are of very short duration and are highly peaked, point processes or counting processes are the most commonly used probability models for neural spike trains, with points on the time axis representing the temporal location of the spikes [see, for example, Brillinger (1992)].

Let $N(t)$ denote the number of spikes on the interval $[0, t)$. $N(\cdot)$ counts the number of spikes and hence is a counting process. Let $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_{N(t)}$ be all the spike times occurring in $[0, t)$. We assume that the following limit exists:

$$\lambda(t|w_1, \dots, w_{N(t)}) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} E[N(t+\delta) - N(t)|w_1, \dots, w_{N(t)}], \quad \text{a.s.}$$

$\lambda(\cdot|\cdot)$ is known as the conditional intensity of $N(\cdot)$.

¹AMS 2000 *subject classifications*. Primary 62E20; secondary 62G20, 62M20.

Key words and phrases. Boundary crossing probability, change of measure, conditional intensity, counting process, importance sampling, metric entropy, neural spike train, Poisson process, rate of convergence, refractory period, scan statistics, sieve maximum likelihood estimation, template matching.

In the neuroscience literature, a number of probability models for $\lambda(\cdot|\cdot)$ have been proposed. One of the simplest is when $\lambda(t|w_1, \dots, w_{N(t)})$ depends only on t . This leads to an inhomogeneous Poisson process [see, for example, Ventura *et al.* (2002)]. It is well known that for a short period of time after a spike has been discharged, it is more difficult or even impossible for a neuron to fire another spike [see, for example, Dayan and Abbott (2001), page 4]. Such a time interval is called the refractory period. The main drawback with the inhomogeneous Poisson process model is that it does not incorporate the refractory period of the neuron. To account for this, a number of researchers [for example, Johnson and Swami (1983) and Kass and Ventura (2001)] have proposed modeling $\lambda(\cdot|\cdot)$ by

$$\lambda_0(t|w_1, \dots, w_{N(t)}) = f(t, t - w_{N(t)}),$$

where f is a nonnegative function. This model is Markovian in that it only depends on the present time t and the duration $t - w_{N(t)}$ since the last spike.

A simpler alternative model for the conditional intensity of $N(\cdot)$ that has been proposed in the literature [see, for example, Johnson and Swami (1983), Miller (1985) and Berry and Meister (1998)] is

$$(1) \quad \lambda_1(t|w_1, \dots, w_{N(t)}) = \begin{cases} s(t) & \text{if } N(t) = 0, \\ s(t)r(t - w_{N(t)}) & \text{if } N(t) \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where s, r are nonnegative functions. s and r are known as the free firing rate function and the recovery function respectively. This model has the added attractiveness of easy interpretability.

This article consists of two parts. The first part considers sieve maximum likelihood estimation of s and r in (1) based on n independent realizations of $N(t), t \in [0, T]$, where $0 < T < \infty$ and $N(\cdot)$ is a counting process with conditional intensity $\lambda_1(\cdot|\cdot)$. Here we assume that the true free firing rate function s and recovery function r both lie in the class of q -smooth functions $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ where $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ is defined as in (3). Section 2 computes upper bounds on the metric entropy of $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ as well as other function spaces induced by $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$. These results are needed in Section 3.

Section 3 focuses on sieve maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{s}_n$ and $\hat{r}_n$ for s and r respectively. Assuming that there exists an absolute refractory period (that is, there exists a constant $\theta > 0$ such that $r(u) = 0$, for all $u \in [0, \theta]$), it is proved in Theorem 2 that for $q > 1/2$,

$$E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If, in addition, $s(t) > 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$, then Theorem 2 shows that

$$E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\hat{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where T^* is an arbitrary but fixed constant satisfying $0 < T^* < T$.

In Section 4, corresponding lower bounds for the convergence rate are established. In particular under the assumptions of Section 3, Theorems 3 and 4 prove that it is not possible to achieve a faster convergence rate than $n^{-q/(2q+1)}$. Thus we conclude that sieve maximum

likelihood estimators for s and r achieved essentially the optimal convergence rate (except for a logarithmic factor).

The second part of the article deals with the detection of multiple spike train patterns. Let $\mathbf{w}^{(i)} = \{w_1^{(i)}, \dots, w_{N_i(T)}^{(i)}\}$ be the spike times of the i th neuron for $1 \leq i \leq d$, and let $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(d)})$. Loosely speaking, the pattern or template $\mathbf{w}$ is said to have occurred at time t in the spike trains $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(d)})$ if for most $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap [t, t+T)$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, there exists $w \in \mathbf{w}^{(i)}$ such that $y - w - t$ is close to 0. A more rigorous definition of a match, via a user-chosen score function, is given in Section 5. When the number of matches is significantly large, we can identify the onset of the patterns $\mathbf{w}$ in $\mathbf{y}$ with the stimulus provided to the subjects when $\mathbf{w}$ is recorded. For example, $\mathbf{w}$ can be the spike times of an assembly of neurons of a zebra finch when its own song is played while awake and $\mathbf{y}$ is the spike trains of the same assembly when it is sleeping. The replaying of these patterns during sleep has been hypothesized to play an important role in bird song learning [cf. Dave and Margoliash (2000) and Mooney (2000)].

In Brown, Kass and Mitra (2004), it was stated that “research in statistics and signal processing on multivariate point process models has not been nearly as extensive as research on models of multivariate continuous-valued processes” in the section titled “future challenges for multiple spike train data analysis”. We develop in Sections 5 and 6 a theory for computing the distribution of scan statistics in multivariate point processes and apply it to obtain p -values for template matching. The accuracy of these computations is then verified independently via computer experiments.

2 Metric entropy

In this section, suppose $N(\cdot)$ is a counting process with conditional intensity $\lambda_1(\cdot|\cdot)$ as given by (1). We assume that a realization of N is observed on the interval $[0, T)$, $0 < T < \infty$, and that the spike times are $0 < w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_{N(T)} < T$. It is convenient to let $\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}$ denote the point process corresponding to $N(t)$, $t \in [0, T)$, and $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all possible realizations of $\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}$. It follows from Chapter 7 of Daley and Vere-Jones (2002) that the likelihood is the local Janossy density given by

$$(2) \quad p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) = e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{N(t)})dt} \prod_{j=1}^{N(T)} s(w_j)r(w_j - w_{j-1}),$$

and hence its log-likelihood function is

$$\begin{aligned} l(s, r|\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) &= -\int_0^T s(t)r(t - w_{N(t)})dt + \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \log[s(w_j)r(w_j - w_{j-1})] \\ &= -\int_0^{w_1 \wedge T} s(t)dt - \int_{w_1 \wedge T}^T s(t)r(t - w_{N(t)})dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \log[s(w_j)r(w_j - w_{j-1})], \end{aligned}$$

where $r(t - w_0) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T)$.

Next let q, q_0, q_1 be constants satisfying $q > 0$, $q = q_0 + q_1$, q_0 a nonnegative integer and $0 < q_1 \leq 1$. Furthermore we write $\tilde{\kappa} = (\kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_{q_0+1})$ to be a vector of strictly positive constants. In this section, we assume that the true free firing rate function s and the recovery function r lie in the q -smooth function class $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ where

$$(3) \quad \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q} = \left\{ f = g^2 : g \in \mathcal{C}^{q_0}[0, T), \min_{t \in [0, T)} g(t) \geq 0, \max_{t \in [0, T)} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} g(t) \right| < \kappa_j, j = 0, \dots, q_0, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_1) - \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_2) \right| < \kappa_{q_0+1} |t_1 - t_2|^{q_1}, \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, T) \right\}.$$

Let $\{0 < \delta_n \leq 1 : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a sequence of constants (to be suitably chosen later and δ_n depends only on n) such that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We define a sieve for the parameter space of $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ by

$$\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} = \left\{ f = g^2 : g \in \mathcal{C}^{q_0}[0, T), \min_{t \in [0, T)} g(t) \geq \delta_n, \max_{t \in [0, T)} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} g(t) \right| < \kappa_j, j = 0, \dots, q_0, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_1) - \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_2) \right| < \kappa_{q_0+1} |t_1 - t_2|^{q_1}, \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, T) \right\}.$$

Let $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ and $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$ be endowed with the metrics $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}}$ and $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}$ respectively where

$$\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}}(f_1, f_2) = \sup_{t \in [0, T)} |f_1^{1/2}(t) - f_2^{1/2}(t)|, \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, \\ \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}(f_1, f_2) = \sup_{t \in [0, T)} |f_1^{1/2}(t) - f_2^{1/2}(t)|, \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}.$$

We observe that any $f \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ can be approximated arbitrarily closely by $(f^{1/2} + \delta_n)^2 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$ by choosing n sufficiently large. Consequently a sieve for the parameter space of (s, r) can now be expressed as $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2 = \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \times \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$ with metric $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2}$ where

$$\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2}((f_1, g_1), (f_2, g_2)) = \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}(f_1, f_2) + \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}(g_1, g_2), \quad \forall (f_1, g_1), (f_2, g_2) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2.$$

Next let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} = \{p_{s_1, r_1} \text{ is as in (2): } (s_1, r_1) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2\},$$

be endowed with the Hellinger metric $\rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}$ where

$$\rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}}(p_{s_1, r_1}, p_{s_2, r_2}) \\ = \|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s_2, r_2}^{1/2}\|_2 \\ = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - p_{s_2, r_2}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \dots dw_j \right\}^{1/2}.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2(\varepsilon) \subseteq \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2$ denote a finite ε -net for $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2$ with respect to the metric $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2}$. This implies that for each $(s_1, r_1) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2$, there exists a $(s_2, r_2) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2(\varepsilon)$ such that $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon$.

Now suppose that for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist measurable nonnegative functions $f_{l,\varepsilon}$ and $f_{u,\varepsilon}$ on $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2(\varepsilon) \times \mathcal{N}$ such that for each $(s_1, r_1) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2$, there is some $(s_2, r_2) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2(\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$(4) \quad \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon,$$

with

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{l,\varepsilon}((s_2, r_2), \{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) &\leq p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) \\ &\leq f_{u,\varepsilon}((s_2, r_2), \{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6) \quad \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [f_{u,\varepsilon}^{1/2}((s_2, r_2), \{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - f_{l,\varepsilon}^{1/2}((s_2, r_2), \{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \dots dw_j \right\}^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

DEFINITION. For $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε -entropy of $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2$ with respect to the metric $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}$ is defined to be

$$H(\varepsilon, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}) = \log[\min\{\text{card } \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2(\varepsilon): \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2(\varepsilon) \text{ is a } \varepsilon\text{-net for } \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2 \text{ with respect to the metric } \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}\}].$$

The ε -entropies of $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}$ with respect to $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}$ and $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ with respect to $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}$ are defined in a similar manner.

DEFINITION. The ε -entropy of $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ with bracketing with respect to the metric $\rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}$ is defined to be

$$H^B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) = \log[\min\{\text{card } \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2(\varepsilon): (4), (5) \text{ and } (6) \text{ are satisfied}\}].$$

We observe from Kolmogorov and Tihomirov (1961), page 308, and Dudley (1999), page 11, that the ε -entropy of $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ satisfies

$$H(\varepsilon, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq H(\varepsilon, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}) \leq \frac{C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}{\varepsilon^{1/q}},$$

and hence

$$(7) \quad H(\varepsilon, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}) \leq 2H\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \leq \frac{2^{(q+1)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}{\varepsilon^{1/q}},$$

where $C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}$ is a constant depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$ and q . Thus we conclude from Lemma 10 in Appendix A that

$$H^B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq \frac{2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}{\varepsilon^{1/q}},$$

where $C_{\tilde{\kappa}}$ is a constant that depends only on $\tilde{\kappa}$.

Next let $f: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow R$ be a nonnegative function such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 \leq w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} f(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) dw_1 \dots dw_j < \infty.$$

We follow Wong and Shen (1995) by defining

$$Z_f(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) = \log\left[\frac{f(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\})}{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\})}\right],$$

where s is the true free firing rate function and r the true recovery function. For $\tau > 0$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{f}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) \\ = & \begin{cases} f(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), & \text{if } f(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) \geq e^{-\tau} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), \\ e^{-\tau} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), & \text{if } f(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) < e^{-\tau} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(8) \quad \tilde{Z}_f = Z_{\tilde{f}} = \begin{cases} Z_f, & \text{if } Z_f \geq -\tau, \\ -\tau, & \text{if } Z_f < -\tau. \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n} = \{\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} : p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}\}$ be the space of truncated log-likelihood ratios (based on one observation). Define $H^B(\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})$ to be the ε -entropy of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ with bracketing with respect to the metric

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}, \tilde{Z}_{p_{s_2,r_2}}) \\ = & \left\{ E_{s,r} [\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) - \tilde{Z}_{p_{s_2,r_2}}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\})]^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ = & \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - \tilde{Z}_{p_{s_2,r_2}}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 \right. \\ & \left. \times e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \left[\prod_{i=1}^j s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1}) \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta(t) = \max\{k \geq 0 : w_k < t\}$ and $E_{s,r}$ denotes expectation when the true free firing rate function is s and the recovery function is r . We observe from Lemma 11 in Appendix A that

$$(9) \quad H^B(\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq 2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q} \left(\frac{2e^{\tau/2}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1/q}.$$

3 Sieve maximum likelihood estimation

In this section, we assume that we have n independent identically distributed copies of $N(t), t \in [0, T)$, with conditional intensity as given by (1). Let these n copies be denoted by $N_i(t), t \in [0, T)$, and the spike times be written as $0 < w_{i,1} < \dots < w_{i,N_i(T)} < T$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Inspired by Wong and Shen (1995), we shall first establish a number of likelihood ratio probability inequalities.

Proposition 1 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $C_{\tilde{\kappa}}, C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}$ be as in (9). Suppose that*

$$(10) \quad \int_{\varepsilon^2/2^8}^{\sqrt{2}\varepsilon} [2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q} \left(\frac{10}{x} \right)^{1/q}]^{1/2} dx \leq \frac{n^{1/2} \varepsilon^2}{2^{13} \sqrt{2}}.$$

Then

$$P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1,r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/8} \right\} \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2^7(250)}\right].$$

$P_{s,r}^*$ is the outer measure corresponding to the density $p_{s,r}$.

We refer the reader to Appendix A for a proof of Proposition 1.

Next we define nonnegative functions $s_n^\dagger$ and $r_n^\dagger$ on $t \in [0, T)$ by

$$(11) \quad \sqrt{s_n^\dagger(t)} = \sqrt{s(t)} + \delta_n, \quad \sqrt{r_n^\dagger(t)} = \sqrt{r(t)} + \delta_n,$$

where $\{0 < \delta_n \leq 1 : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is as in Section 2. Since $s, r \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}$, we have $s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ and $p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ for sufficiently large n . We further observe from Lemma 8 of Wong and Shen (1995) and Lemma 14 in Appendix A that

$$0 \leq \delta_n^\dagger := E_{s,r} \left(\frac{p_{s,r}}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}} - 1 \right) \leq C_{\tilde{\kappa},1} \delta_n,$$

where $C_{\tilde{\kappa},1}$ is a constant depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$.

Proposition 2 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1, \delta_n^\dagger \leq 1$ and that (10) holds. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1,r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/16} \right\} \\ & \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. First we observe from Proposition 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1,r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/16} \right\} \\ & \leq P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1,r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/8} \right\} \\ & \quad + P_{s,r} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{n\varepsilon^2/16} \right\} \\ & \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + P_{s,r} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{n\varepsilon^2/16} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now using Markov's inequality,

$$P_{s,r} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{n\varepsilon^2/16} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/16} \prod_{i=1}^n E_{s,r} \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \right] \\
&= (1 + \delta_n^\dagger)^n e^{-n\varepsilon^2/16} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{16} + n\delta_n^\dagger\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Proposition 2. $\square$

DEFINITION. Let η_n be a sequence of positive numbers converging to 0. We call an estimator $p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n} : \mathcal{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ a η_n -sieve MLE of $p_{s,r}$ if $(\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}^2$ and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log[p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})] \geq \sup_{p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log[p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})] - \eta_n.$$

The corresponding $\hat{s}_n$ and $\hat{r}_n$ are called η_n -sieve MLEs of s and r respectively.

DEFINITION. If δ_n in Section 2 satisfies $\delta_n = 0$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then a η_n -sieve MLE $p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}$ is more simply called a η_n -MLE of $p_{s,r}$.

Proposition 3 *Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be the smallest value of ε satisfying (10) and $0 < \eta_n < \varepsilon_n^2/16$. If $p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}$ is a η_n -sieve MLE of $p_{s,r}$, then*

$$P_{s,r}(\|p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_n) \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{27(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right],$$

where $P_{s,r}$ denotes probability when the true free firing rate function is s and the recovery function is r .

PROOF. We observe from Proposition 2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_{s,r}(\|p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_n) \\
&\leq P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_n, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\eta_n} \right\} \\
&\leq P_{s,r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_n, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon_n^2/16} \right\} \\
&\leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{27(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Proposition 3. $\square$

Theorem 1 *Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be the smallest value of ε satisfying (10), $q > 1/2$ and $0 < \eta_n < \varepsilon_n^2/16$. If $p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}$ is a η_n -MLE of $p_{s,r}$, then*

$$E_{s,r} \|p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)}), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. We observe that $\delta_n^\dagger = 0$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ (from the definition of η_n -MLE) and ε_n is exactly of order $n^{-q/(2q+1)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we observe from Proposition 3 that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{s,r} \|p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 &\leq \varepsilon_n + 8 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + 2 \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right] \\ &= O(n^{-q/(2q+1)}), \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Now we assume that there exists a refractory period in which the neuron cannot discharge another spike after a spike had been fired [see, for example, Brillinger (1992) and Johnson and Swami (1983)]. More precisely, we suppose that there exists a constant $\theta > 0$ such that

$$(12) \quad r(u) = 0, \quad \forall u \in [0, \theta].$$

Then the number of spikes on the interval $[0, T)$ can be at most $n_\theta = \lceil T/\theta \rceil$.

Proposition 4 *Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be the smallest value of ε satisfying (10) and $0 < \eta_n < \varepsilon_n^2/16 \leq (1 - e^{-1})^2/32$. If (12) holds and $p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}$ is a η_n -sieve MLE of $p_{s,r}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s,r} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \right. \\ \left. > \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log\left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}}\right)\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\} \\ \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_0 \vee 1$.

PROOF. First we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} \frac{p_{s,r}^2(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} \frac{e^{-2 \int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s^2(w_i) r^2(w_i - w_{i-1})}{e^{-\int_0^T \hat{s}_n(t)\hat{r}_n(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j \hat{s}_n(w_i)\hat{r}_n(w_i - w_{i-1})} dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ &\leq \frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T}}{\delta_n^{4n_\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we observe from Theorem 5 of Wong and Shen (1995) that

$$\|p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon_n^2 \leq (1 - e^{-1})^2/2$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ &\leq \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log\left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}}\right)\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows from Proposition 3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \right. \\
& \quad \left. > \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}})\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\} \\
& \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Proposition 4. $\square$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2 *Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be the smallest value of ε satisfying (10), $q > 1/2$, $0 < \eta_n < \varepsilon_n^2/16$ and $\delta_n = n^{-\alpha}$ for some constant $\alpha \in (2q/(2q+1), 1)$. Suppose that (12) holds and $\hat{s}_n, \hat{r}_n$ are η_n -sieve MLEs of s, r respectively. Then*

$$E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If, in addition, $s(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, then

$$E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\hat{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where T^* is any constant satisfying $0 < T^* < T$.

PROOF. First we observe from (10) that ε_n is exactly of order $n^{-q/(2q+1)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We observe from Proposition 4 and Lemma 15 (in Appendix A) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r} \left\{ \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right]^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. \leq \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}})\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\} \\
& \geq 1 - 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] - \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r} \left\{ \int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \leq \left\{ \max\{20 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt, 200\} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}})\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\}^{1/2} \right\} \\
& \geq 1 - 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] - \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right] \\
& \leq \left\{ \max \left\{ 20 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt, 200 \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max \left\{ 1, \log \left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}} \right) \right\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \kappa_0^2 T \left\{ 4 \exp \left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)} \right] + \exp \left[-n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger \right) \right] \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] \\
& \leq \left\{ \max \left\{ 20 \kappa_0^2 T e^{2\kappa_0^2 T}, 200 e^{2\kappa_0^2 T} \right\} \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max \left\{ 1, \log \left[\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}} \right] \right\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
(13) \quad & + \kappa_0^2 T e^{\kappa_0^2 T} \left\{ 4 \exp \left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)} \right] + \exp \left[-n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger \right) \right] \right\} \\
& = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n),
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next we assume, in addition, that $s(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Let $\xi(t), t \in [0, T]$ be as in (86). Since $s \in \Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q}$ and

$$s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} \leq \xi(t) \leq \max \{s(t), s(t)r(u) : u \in [0, T]\},$$

we have $0 < \min_{0 \leq t < T} \xi(t) \leq \max_{0 \leq t < T} \xi(t) \leq \bar{\kappa}^4$. Thus as in the previous case,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r} \left\{ \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} dudt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t) r(u)| \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} dudt \right]^2 \\
& \quad \leq \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max \left\{ 1, \log \left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}} \right) \right\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \Big\} \\
& \geq 1 - 4 \exp \left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)} \right] - \exp \left[-n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger \right) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t) r(u)| \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} dudt \right. \\
& \quad \leq \left\{ \max \left\{ 20 \int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} dudt, 200 \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max \left\{ 1, \log \left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}} \right) \right\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \Big\} \\
& \geq 1 - 4 \exp \left[-\frac{n \varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)} \right] - \exp \left[-n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t)r(u)| \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v)r(v-t+u)dv} dudt \right] \\
& \leq \left\{ \max\{20 \int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-u) s(t)r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v)r(v-t+u)dv} dudt, 200\} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1-e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log\left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}}\right)\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \bar{\kappa}^8 T^2 \left\{ 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right] \right\} \\
& \leq \left\{ \max\{20\bar{\kappa}^8 T^2, 200\} \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1-e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log\left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}}\right)\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \bar{\kappa}^8 T^2 \left\{ 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right] \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t)r(u)| dudt \right] \\
& \leq \left\{ \frac{\max\{20\bar{\kappa}^8 T^2 e^{2\bar{\kappa}^4 T}, 200 e^{2\bar{\kappa}^4 T}\}}{\min_{0 \leq t < T} \xi^2(t)} \left[6 + \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1-e^{-1})^2} + 8 \max\{1, \log\left(\frac{e^{\bar{\kappa}^4(\bar{\kappa}^4+1)T/2}}{\varepsilon_n \delta_n^{2n_\theta}}\right)\} \right] \varepsilon_n^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
(14) \quad & + \frac{\bar{\kappa}^8 T^2 e^{\bar{\kappa}^4 T}}{\min_{0 \leq t < T} \xi(t)} \left\{ 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon_n^2}{2^7(250)}\right] + \exp\left[-n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n^2}{16} - \delta_n^\dagger\right)\right] \right\} \\
& = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n),
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\min_{0 \leq t < T} s(t) \right] E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{r}_n(u) - r(u)| (T-u) du \right] \\
& \leq E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_u^T s(t) |\hat{r}_n(u) - r(u)| dt du \right] \\
& \leq E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| \int_0^t \hat{r}_n(u) dudt \right] + E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t)r(u)| dudt \right] \\
& \leq \bar{\kappa}^2 T E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] + E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t)r(u)| dudt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude from (13) and (14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\hat{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] \\
& \leq \frac{\bar{\kappa}^2 T}{(T-T^*) \min_{0 \leq t < T} s(t)} E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\hat{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{(T-T^*) \min_{0 \leq t < T} s(t)} E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |\hat{s}_n(t) \hat{r}_n(u) - s(t)r(u)| dudt \right] \\
& = O(n^{-q/(2q+1)} \log^{1/2} n),
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This proves the theorem. $\square$

4 Lower bounds

Suppose $N(\cdot)$ is a counting process with conditional intensity $\lambda_1(\cdot|\cdot)$ as given by (1). Let $N_1(\cdot), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T)$, be independent identically distributed copies of $N(t), t \in [0, T)$. In this section we shall compute lower bounds on the rate of convergence of an estimator for s and an estimator for r based on $N_1(t), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T)$.

Let $0 < \theta < T$ be as in (12) and $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ be as in Section 2. Define

$$\Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} = \left\{ f = g^2 : g \in \mathcal{C}^{q_0}[0, T), \min_{t \in [0, T)} g(t) \geq 0, \max_{t \in [0, T)} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} g(t) \right| < \kappa_j, j = 0, \dots, q_0, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_1) - \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} g(t_2) \right| \leq \kappa_{q_0+1} |t_1 - t_2|^{q_1}, \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, T), g(t) = 0 \text{ if } t \in [0, \theta] \right\}.$$

Lemma 1 *Let $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \subseteq \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ such that $\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) < \infty$. Suppose that $\tilde{s}_n$ is an estimator for s based on $N_1(t), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T)$. Then*

$$(15) \quad \sup \{ E_{s, r} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} \} \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \int_0^T |s_1(t) - s_2(t)| dt : s_1 \neq s_2, s_1, s_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \right\} \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\log[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) - 1]} \left[\log 2 \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n})]^2} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{s_1, r_1} \log \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_2, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \right] \right\},$$

for any $r_1 \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}$. Next suppose that $\tilde{r}_n$ is an estimator for r based on $N_1(t), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T)$. Let T^* be a constant satisfying $\theta < T^* < T$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \subset \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}$ such that $\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) < \infty$ and $r_1(u) = r_2(u), u \in [T^*, T) \forall r_1, r_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$. Then

$$(16) \quad \sup \{ E_{s, r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\tilde{r}_n(t) - r(t)| dt \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} \} \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \int_0^{T^*} |r_1(t) - r_2(t)| dt : r_1 \neq r_2, r_1, r_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \right\} \\ \times \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\log[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) - 1]} \left[\log 2 \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n})]^2} \sum_{r_1, r_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{s_1, r_1} \log \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_1, r_2}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \right] \right\},$$

for any $s_1 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$.

We refer the reader to Appendix A for a proof of Lemma 1. Theorems 3 and 4 (below) are the main results of this section. They are motivated by the lower bound results in Yatracos (1988).

Theorem 3 Let $q > 0$. Suppose that $\tilde{s}_n$ is an estimator for s based on $N_1(t), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T)$. Then there exists a constant $C_{\tilde{\kappa}, q} > 0$ (depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$ and q) such that

$$\sup\{E_{s,r}[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}\} \geq C_{\tilde{\kappa}, q} n^{-q/(2q+1)}.$$

PROOF. Let $\{b_n > 0 : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a sequence of constants that tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and that b_n^{-1} is an integer. For $i = 1, \dots, b_n^{-1}$, define $\phi_{i,n} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi_{i,n}(t) = \begin{cases} (b_n T)^q [1 - (\frac{2t - (2i-1)b_n T}{b_n T})^2]^q, & \text{if } (i-1)b_n T \leq t < ib_n T, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Writing $q = q_0 + q_1$, q_0 a nonnegative integer and $0 < q_1 \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{t \in [0, T)} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} \phi_{i,n}(t) \right| &< \infty, \quad \forall j = 0, \dots, q_0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{t_1 \neq t_2 \in [0, T)} \left| \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} \phi_{i,n}(t_1) - \frac{d^{q_0}}{dt^{q_0}} \phi_{i,n}(t_2) \right| / |t_1 - t_2|^{q_1} &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Xi_{a,n}$ denote functions of the form

$$a[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_i \phi_{i,n}(t)]^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T),$$

where $\gamma_i = 0$ or 1 and $a > 0$ is a suitably small constant such that $\Xi_{a,n} \subset \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$. If $s_1, s_2 \in \Xi_{a,n}$ where $s_1 \neq s_2$, then writing

$$(17) \quad s_1(t) = a[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_{1,i} \phi_{i,n}(t)]^2, \quad s_2(t) = a[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_{2,i} \phi_{i,n}(t)]^2,$$

with $\gamma_{1,i}, \gamma_{2,i}$ taking values 0 or 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T |s_1(t) - s_2(t)| dt &= a \int_0^T |2 \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} (\gamma_{1,i} - \gamma_{2,i}) \phi_{i,n}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} (\gamma_{1,i} - \gamma_{2,i}) \phi_{i,n}^2(t)| dt \\ &\geq a \int_0^{b_n T} [2\phi_{1,n}(t) + \phi_{1,n}^2(t)] dt \\ &= a(b_n T)^{q+1} J_q + \frac{a(b_n T)^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(18) \quad J_l = \int_{-1}^1 (1 - y^2)^l dy > 0, \quad \forall l > 0.$$

Also it follows from (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{s_1(t) - s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} \right| &\leq 2a\phi_{i,n}(t) + a\phi_{i,n}^2(t) \\ &\leq 2a(b_n T)^q + a(b_n T)^{2q}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T). \end{aligned}$$

Let $r_1 \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}$. Now using Lemma 15 in Appendix A,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s_1, r_1} \log \left[\frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_2, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \right] \\
&= \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} \right] \right\} s_1(t) e^{-\int_0^t s_1(u) du} dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} \right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s_1(t) r_1(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s_1(v) r_1(v-t+u) dv} dudt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left(\frac{s_1(t) - s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} \right)^2 s_1(t) e^{-\int_0^t s_1(u) du} dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_0^t \left(\frac{s_1(t) - s_2(t)}{s_1(t)} \right)^2 \xi(t-u) s_1(t) r_1(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s_1(v) r_1(v-t+u) dv} dudt \\
&\leq \frac{a^2(b_n T)^{2q}}{2} [2 + (b_n T)^q]^2 (1 + \tilde{\kappa}^8 T^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa_0 \vee 1$. Finally we observe from Proposition 3.8 of Birgé (1983) that there exists a subset $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$ of $\Xi_{a, n}$ such that

$$\int_0^T |s_1(t) - s_2(t)| dt \geq \frac{1}{8b_n} [a(b_n T)^{q+1} J_q + \frac{a(b_n T)^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2}], \quad \forall s_1 \neq s_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n},$$

and $\log[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) - 1] > 0.316/b_n$. Consequently we conclude from (15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup \{ E_{s, r} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} \} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{16b_n} [a(b_n T)^{q+1} J_q + \frac{a(b_n T)^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2}] \left\{ 1 - \frac{b_n}{0.316} \left[\log 2 + \frac{a^2 n (b_n T)^{2q}}{2} [2 + (b_n T)^q]^2 (1 + \tilde{\kappa}^8 T^2) \right] \right\} \\
&= \frac{ab_n^q T^{q+1}}{16} [J_q + \frac{(b_n T)^q J_{2q}}{2}] \left\{ 1 - \frac{b_n}{0.316} \left[\log 2 + \frac{a^2 n (b_n T)^{2q}}{2} [2 + (b_n T)^q]^2 (1 + \tilde{\kappa}^8 T^2) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that there exist strictly positive constants C_0 and $C_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$ (depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$ and q) such that by taking $b_n = 1/\lceil C_0 n^{1/(2q+1)} \rceil$, we have

$$\sup \{ E_{s, r} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} \} \geq C_{\tilde{\kappa}, q} n^{-q/(2q+1)}.$$

This proves Theorem 3. $\square$

Theorem 4 Let $q > 0$ and θ, T^* be constants satisfying $0 < \theta < T^* < T$. Suppose that $\tilde{r}_n$ is an estimator for r based on $N_1(t), \dots, N_n(t), t \in [0, T]$. Then there exists a constant $C_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} > 0$ (depending only on $\theta, \tilde{\kappa}$ and q) such that

$$\sup \{ E_{s, r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\tilde{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} \} \geq C_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q} n^{-q/(2q+1)}.$$

PROOF. Let $f \in \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}$ such that $f(u) > 0$ if $u \in [\theta^*, T^*]$ for constants θ^*, T^* satisfying $0 < \theta < \theta^* < T^* < T$. Then $0 < \underline{f} := \min_{u \in [\theta^*, T^*]} f(u) \leq \bar{f} := \max_{u \in [\theta^*, T^*]} f(u) < \infty$. Let $\{b_n > 0 : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a sequence of constants that tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that b_n^{-1} is an integer. Then for $i = 1, \dots, b_n^{-1}$, define $\phi_{i,n} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi_{i,n}(u) = \begin{cases} [b_n(T^* - \theta^*)]^q [1 - (\frac{2u - 2\theta^* - (2i-1)b_n(T^* - \theta^*)}{b_n(T^* - \theta^*)})^2]^q, & \text{if } \theta^* + (i-1)b_n(T^* - \theta^*) \leq u < \theta^* + ib_n(T^* - \theta^*), \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\Xi_{a,n}$ denote functions of the form

$$a[f^{1/2}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_i \phi_{i,n}(u)]^2, \quad \forall u \in [0, T],$$

where $\gamma_i = 0$ or 1 and $a > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant such that $\Xi_{a,n} \subset \Theta_{\theta, \tilde{\kappa}, q}$. If $r_1, r_2 \in \Xi_{a,n}$ where $r_1 \neq r_2$, then writing

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(u) &= a[f^{1/2}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_{1,i} \phi_{i,n}(u)]^2, \\ r_2(u) &= a[f^{1/2}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} \gamma_{2,i} \phi_{i,n}(u)]^2, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

with $\gamma_{1,i}, \gamma_{2,i}$ taking values 0 or 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{T^*} |r_1(u) - r_2(u)| du \\ &= a \int_{\theta^*}^{T^*} |2f^{1/2}(u) \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} (\gamma_{1,i} - \gamma_{2,i}) \phi_{i,n}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{b_n^{-1}} (\gamma_{1,i} - \gamma_{2,i}) \phi_{i,n}^2(u)| du \\ &\geq a \int_{\theta^*}^{\theta^* + b_n(T^* - \theta^*)} |2\underline{f}^{1/2} \phi_{1,n}(u) + \phi_{1,n}^2(u)| du \\ &= a \underline{f}^{1/2} [b_n(T^* - \theta^*)]^{q+1} J_q + \frac{a[b_n(T^* - \theta^*)]^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where J_q is as in (18). Also it follows from (19) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{r_1(u) - r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} \right| &\leq \frac{2a\bar{f}^{1/2}\phi_{i,n}(u) + a\phi_{i,n}^2(u)}{\underline{f}^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{2a\bar{f}^{1/2}[b_n(T^* - \theta^*)]^q}{\underline{f}^{1/2}} + \frac{a[b_n(T^* - \theta^*)]^{2q}}{\underline{f}^{1/2}}, \quad \forall u \in [\theta^*, T^*]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $s_1 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q}$. Now using Lemma 15,

$$E_{s_1, r_1} \log \left[\frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s_1, r_2}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} \right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s_1(t) r_1(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s_1(v) r_1(v-t+u) dv} du dt \\
&= \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} \right] \right\} \int_u^T \xi(t-u) s_1(t) r_1(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s_1(v) r_1(v-t+u) dv} dt du \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\theta^*}^{T^*} \left(\frac{r_1(u) - r_2(u)}{r_1(u)} \right)^2 \int_u^T \xi(t-u) s_1(t) r_1(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s_1(v) r_1(v-t+u) dv} dt du \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{\kappa}^8 b_n^{2q} (T - \theta^*)^2 [2a \bar{f}^{1/2} (T^* - \theta^*)^q + a b_n^q (T^* - \theta^*)^{2q}]^2}{2\underline{f}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_0 \vee 1$. Finally we observe from Proposition 3.8 of Birgé (1983) that there exists a subset $\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \bar{\kappa}, q, n}$ of $\Xi_{a, n}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T^*} |r_1(u) - r_2(u)| du \\
&\geq \frac{1}{8b_n} \left[a \underline{f}^{1/2} [b_n (T^* - \theta^*)]^{q+1} J_q + \frac{a [b_n (T^* - \theta^*)]^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2} \right], \quad \forall r_1 \neq r_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \bar{\kappa}, n},
\end{aligned}$$

and $\log[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\theta, T^*, \bar{\kappa}, n}) - 1] > 0.316/b_n$. Consequently we conclude from (16) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup \{ E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\tilde{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] : s \in \Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \bar{\kappa}, q} \} \\
&\geq \frac{a b_n^q}{16} \left[\underline{f}^{1/2} (T^* - \theta^*)^{q+1} J_q + \frac{b_n^q (T^* - \theta^*)^{2q+1} J_{2q}}{2} \right] \left\{ 1 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{b_n}{0.316} \left[\log 2 + \frac{a \bar{\kappa}^8 n b_n^{2q} (T - \theta^*)^2 [2 \bar{f}^{1/2} (T^* - \theta^*)^q + b_n^q (T^* - \theta^*)^{2q}]^2}{2\underline{f}} \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence there exist strictly positive constants C_1 and $C_{\theta, \bar{\kappa}, q}$ (depending only on $\theta, \bar{\kappa}$ and q) such that by taking $b_n = 1/\lceil C_1 n^{1/(2q+1)} \rceil$, we have

$$\sup \{ E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^{T^*} |\tilde{r}_n(u) - r(u)| du \right] : s \in \Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta, \bar{\kappa}, q} \} \geq C_{\theta, \bar{\kappa}, q} n^{-q/(2q+1)}.$$

This proves Theorem 4. □

5 Template matching with continuous kernels

In the second part of this article, let $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(d)})$ be the spike train pattern of an assembly of d neurons recorded when an experimental stimulus is provided to a subject, where $\mathbf{w}^{(i)} = \{w_1^{(i)}, \dots, w_{N_i(T)}^{(i)}\}$ are the spike times of the i th neuron over the period $[0, T)$. The same neurons of the subject are subsequently observed for a longer period of time when it is engaged in other activities and the corresponding spike trains $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(d)})$ are checked for occurrences of the template $\mathbf{w}$.

For $t \geq 0$, let $\mathbf{y}_t = (\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t^{(d)})$, where $\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)} = \{y - t : y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap [t, t+T)\}$. There are various algorithms in the neuroscience literature that have been used to determine if there

is a close match between $\mathbf{y}_t$ and $\mathbf{w}$. In Grün, Diesmann and Aertsen (2002), T is chosen small and a match is declared if

$$\{1 \leq i \leq d : \mathbf{w}^{(i)} = \emptyset\} = \{1 \leq i \leq d : \mathbf{y}_t^{(i)} = \emptyset\}.$$

In the sliding sweeps algorithm [cf. Dayhoff and Gerstein (1983) and Nádasdy *et al.* (1999)], a match is declared if

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq d} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{w}^{(i)}} \inf_{y-t \in \mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}} |y - t - w| \leq \Delta,$$

where $\Delta > 0$ is a pre-determined constant. We shall study in this section the pattern filtering algorithm [cf. Chi, Rauske and Margoliasch (2003)], which uses a scoring system to measure the proximity between $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{y}_t$.

Let f be a non-increasing and non-constant function on $[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) > 0$. The score between $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{y}_t$ is given by

$$(20) \quad S_t = \sum_{i=1}^d S_t^{(i)}, \quad \text{where } S_t^{(i)} = T^{-1} \sum_{y-t \in \mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}} \max_{w \in \mathbf{w}^{(i)}} f(|y - t - w|).$$

For a given template $\mathbf{w}$, define the kernel functions

$$(21) \quad g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) = \left[\max_{w \in \mathbf{w}^{(i)}} f(|u - w|) \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq u < T\}}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then we can also express

$$S_t^{(i)} = T^{-1} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - t).$$

The graph of $S_t^{(i)}$ against t is thus a normalized sum of the kernels $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - \cdot)$ over all $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$. We declare a match between $\mathbf{y}_t$ and $\mathbf{w}$ to be present when the proximity score S_t exceeds a pre-determined threshold level c . To prevent overcounting, a match at time t is declared to be new only if the overlap between the time interval $[t, t + T)$ and the time interval of the previous new match is less than αT for some constant $0 < \alpha < 1$. More specifically, let $\sigma_1 = \inf\{t : S_t \geq c\}$ and $\sigma_{j+1} = \inf\{t > \sigma_j + (1 - \alpha)T : S_t \geq c\}$ for $j \geq 1$. Then the number of new matches between the spike trains $\mathbf{y}$ over the time interval $[0, a + T)$ and the template $\mathbf{w}$ is $U_a := \sup\{j : \sigma_j \leq a\}$; with the convention $U_a = 0$ if $\sigma_1 > a$.

To prevent the occurrences of too many (false) matches when $\mathbf{y}$ is pure noise, the threshold level c has to be chosen reasonably large. For a large, there can be on the average more than one new (false) match between $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{w}$. The Poisson distribution is often used for modeling U_a to compute the p -value under such circumstances. For small a , the occurrence of a single match would itself be rare and we can use the probability of having at least one match as the p -value. For this purpose, we study the scan statistics

$$M_a := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq a} S_t,$$

and its dual, the time to detection

$$V_c := \inf\{t : S_t \geq c\},$$

which we shall show to have asymptotic Gumbel and exponential distributions respectively. In this section, we consider f to be continuous on $[0, \infty)$ while in Section 6, we will consider the case in which f is not continuous.

5.1 Main results

Let $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, be independent Poisson processes with constant intensity $\lambda_i > 0$. Consider the following regularity conditions on $\mathbf{w}$ and f .

(A1) Let $\mathbf{w}_*^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_*^{(d)}$ be point processes on $[0, \infty)$ with each $\mathbf{w}_*^{(i)}$ ergodic, stationary and having non-constant inter-arrival times and let $\mathbf{w}^{(i)} = \mathbf{w}_*^{(i)} \cap [0, T)$.

(A2) Let f be continuous and let there be a possibly empty finite set H such that the second derivative of f exists and is uniformly continuous and bounded over any interval inside $\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus H$. Moreover,

$$(22) \quad 0 < \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus H} \left| \frac{d}{dx} f(x) \right| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) > -\infty.$$

Let $\mu_{\mathbf{w}} = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) du$ be the expected value of S_t conditioned on $\mathbf{w}$ known. Let the large deviation rate function of S_t be

$$(23) \quad \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) = \sup_{\theta > 0} \left[\theta c - T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T (e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du \right] \quad \text{for } c > \mu_{\mathbf{w}}.$$

We shall denote by $\theta_{\mathbf{w}} (= \theta_{\mathbf{w},c})$ the unique value of $\theta > 0$ that attains the supremum on the right hand side of (23). By the stationarity of $\mathbf{w}_*^{(i)}$ in (A1), for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, the distribution of $\max_{w \in \mathbf{w}_*^{(i)}} f(|y - w|)$ is equal to the distribution of $Z_i := \max_{w \in \mathbf{w}_*^{(i)}} f(|w|)$. Hence by the ergodicity of $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}$ in (A1) and the bounded property of f in (A2),

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} T^{-1} \int_0^T e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du &\rightarrow E e^{\theta Z_i} \quad \text{a.s. } \forall \theta > 0 \\ \text{and } T^{-1} \int_0^T g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) du &\rightarrow E Z_i \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i E Z_i$. Define the limiting large deviation rate function

$$(25) \quad \phi(c) = \sup_{\theta > 0} \left[\theta c - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i (E e^{\theta Z_i} - 1) \right] \quad \text{for } c > \mu.$$

Let $\theta_* (= \theta_{*,c})$ be the unique value of $\theta > 0$ attaining the supremum on the right hand side of (25). Then by (23), (24) and (25), $\mu_{\mathbf{w}} \rightarrow \mu$, $\phi_{\mathbf{w}} \rightarrow \phi$ pointwise on (μ, ∞) and $\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \rightarrow \theta_*$ a.s. as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly,

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{\mathbf{w}} &:= T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T [g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)]^2 e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du, \\ \tau_{\mathbf{w}} &:= T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T \left[\frac{d}{du} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) \right]^2 e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du \end{aligned}$$

both converge almost surely to positive constants as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Let $P_{\mathbf{w}}$ denote the probability measure conditioned on a known $\mathbf{w}$.

Proposition 5 *Assume (A1)-(A2). Then for any $t \geq 0$, $\Delta > 0$ and $c > \mu$,*

$$(27) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{t < u \leq t + \Delta} S_u \geq c \right\} \sim \Delta \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\zeta_{\mathbf{w}} = (2\pi)^{-1}(\tau_{\mathbf{w}}/v_{\mathbf{w}})^{1/2}$.

By piecing together the local boundary crossing probabilities in (27), we are able to obtain the following results.

Theorem 5 *Assume (A1)-(A2).*

(a) *Let $c > \mu$. Then the distribution (conditional on $\mathbf{w}$) of $\zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} V_c$ converges to the exponential distribution with mean 1 almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$.*

(b) *Let $a \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(\log a)/T$ converges to a positive constant. Let $c_{\mathbf{w}} > \mu_{\mathbf{w}}$ satisfy $\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c_{\mathbf{w}}) = (\log a)/T$. Then for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$P_{\mathbf{w}} \{ \theta_{\mathbf{w}} T (M_a - c_{\mathbf{w}}) - \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} \geq z \} \rightarrow 1 - \exp(-e^{-z}) \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

(c) *Let $a \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(\log a)/T$ converges to a positive constant. Let $c (= c_T)$ be such that $\eta_{\mathbf{w}} := a \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}$ converges to a constant $\eta > 0$ almost surely. Then*

$$(28) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}} \{ U_a = k \} - e^{-\eta_{\mathbf{w}}} \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{w}}^k}{k!} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s. } \forall k = 0, 1, \dots$$

REMARK. Theorem 5 can be extended to deal with the situation in which $m > 1$ trials are conducted, giving rise to m spike train vectors. If we hypothesize that the times of recurrence of the template are the same for the m trials, then the pattern filtering algorithm is most effectively applied by comparing $\mathbf{w}$ against a union of the m spike train vectors. If we hypothesize that the times of recurrence of the template is different for each trial, then we can compare $\mathbf{w}$ against each spike train vector separately and sum up the number of new matches for the m trials. The Poisson distribution can again be used to compute the p -values. Note that we do not require the vectors $\mathbf{y}$ to have the same intensity for the m trials. This has implications when one has a spike train $\mathbf{y}$ that is nonstationary but can be broken up into m segments such that each part has almost constant intensities as we can apply Theorem 5(c) separately on each of the m segments.

REMARK. In Theorem 1 of Chi (2004), it was shown [without the regularity condition (A2)] that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \log V_c \rightarrow \phi(c) \quad \text{a.s. for all } c > \mu.$$

The question of whether $\log V_c = T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) + o(T^{1/2})$ was also raised in a remark on page 157. Theorem 5(a) provides a more precise answer; that $\log V_c = T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) + O_P(1)$.

5.2 Implementation

We conduct a small scale simulation study in this subsection to test the finite sample accuracy of the analytic approximations in Theorem 5. An alternative to analytic approximations is to compute the p -values $p_{\mathbf{w}} := P_{\mathbf{w}}\{M_a \geq c\}$ via direct Monte Carlo. However, as p -values of interest are often small, a large number of simulation runs is required for these estimations to be accurate. The computational cost is compounded when the time period $[0, a + T)$ of $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ is large.

We introduce here an importance sampling alternative for the simulation of p -values. We use a change of measure argument, which is also used in the proof of Proposition 5, by generating $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ from an inhomogeneous Poisson process. Analogous change of measures for computing p -values have been used in sequential analysis [cf. Siegmund (1976)], change-point detection [cf. Lai and Shan (1999)] and DNA sequence alignments [cf. Chan (2003)].

Let $P_{\theta,t}$ denote the probability measure under which $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ is generated as a Poisson point process with intensity $\eta_i(v) = \lambda_i e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v-t)}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq d$. Note that $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v-t) = 0$ for $v \notin [t, t+T)$ and hence the change of measure occurs only for the generation of spikes in the interval $[t, t+T)$. The likelihood of $\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}$ under $P_{\theta,t}$ is given by

$$L_{\theta,t}(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}) = \exp\left(-\lambda_i \int_0^T e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du\right) \prod_{y \in \mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}} \lambda_i e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y-t)}.$$

Hence the likelihood ratio

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_{\theta,t}}{dP_{\mathbf{w}}}(\mathbf{y}) &= \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{L_{\theta,t}(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)})}{L_{0,t}(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)})} = \prod_{i=1}^d \exp\left[\theta T S_t^{(i)} - \lambda_i \int_0^T (e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du\right] \\ (29) \quad &= \exp\left[\theta T S_t - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T (e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du\right]. \end{aligned}$$

In our importance sampling algorithm, we first select a small $\Delta > 0$ such that $J := a/\Delta$ is a positive integer. For each simulation run, we generate j randomly from $\{0, \dots, J\}$ followed by $\mathbf{y}$ from $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}, j\Delta}$. The estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p} &= (J+1) \left[\sum_{j=0}^J \frac{dP_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}, j\Delta}}{dP_{\mathbf{w}}}(\mathbf{y}) \right]^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{M_a \geq c\}} \\ (30) \quad &= (J+1) \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T (e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du\right] \left(\sum_{j=0}^J e^{\theta T S_{j\Delta}}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{M_a \geq c\}} \end{aligned}$$

is then unbiased for $p_{\mathbf{w}}$. The averages of (30) over all the simulation runs is then the importance sampling estimate of $p_{\mathbf{w}}$.

EXAMPLE 1. Consider the Hamming window function

$$(31) \quad f(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(1-\beta) + \frac{1}{2}(1+\beta) \cos\left(\frac{\pi t}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{if } 0 \leq t < \varepsilon, \\ -\beta & \text{if } t \geq \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

with $\varepsilon = 5$ ms and $\beta = 0.4$ [see, for example, Chi, Rauske and Margoliash (2003)].

TABLE 1. Estimates of $P_{\mathbf{w}}\{M_a \geq c\} \pm$ standard error.

c	Direct MC	Imp. Sampling	Anal. Approx. (33)
0.017	0.037 $\pm$ 0.004	0.0387 $\pm$ 0.0019	0.0383
0.018	0.024 $\pm$ 0.003	0.0237 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.0241
0.019	0.016 $\pm$ 0.003	0.0158 $\pm$ 0.0008	0.0149
0.020	0.009 $\pm$ 0.002	0.0095 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.0091
0.021	0.005 $\pm$ 0.002	0.0054 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.0055
0.022	0.003 $\pm$ 0.001	0.0033 $\pm$ 0.0002	0.0033

We generate a template $\mathbf{w}$ over the time interval from 0 to $T = 500$ ms on $d = 4$ spike trains, with interarrival distance X ms between two spikes on each spike train satisfying

$$(32) \quad P\{X \leq x\} = 1 - e^{-(x-1)^+/24}.$$

This corresponds to an absolute refractory period or “dead time” of 1 ms after each spike in $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}$ before the next spike can be generated. In our computer experiment, a total of 80 spikes were generated on the four spike trains using (32).

To compute the p -values using direct Monte Carlo, we generated 2000 realizations of $\mathbf{y}$ by using Poisson point processes with constant intensity $\lambda_i = 0.04 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ on the interval from 0 to $a + T = 20$ s. The proportion of times that $\{M_a \geq c\}$ occurs is taken as the estimate of $p_{\mathbf{w}}$. For importance sampling, 2000 simulation runs were also executed using the algorithm described earlier by choosing $\Delta = 0.2$ ms. The following thinning method is used to generate the spike times in the interval $[j\Delta, j\Delta + T)$, where the intensity of $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ is not constant under $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}, j\Delta}$:

1. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(i)} = \{u_1, \dots, u_N\}$ be generated on $[0, T)$ as a Poisson process with constant intensity $\lambda_i e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} f(0)}$.
2. Generate independent uniform random variables $R_1, \dots, R_N$ on $[0, 1]$ and let

$$\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)} (= \{y - t : y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap [t, t + T)\}) = \{u_j \in \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(i)} : R_j \leq e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} [g_{\mathbf{w}}(u_j) - f(0)]}\}.$$

For the analytic approximation, we apply Theorem 5(a), which gives us

$$(33) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}\{M_a \geq c\} = P_{\mathbf{w}}\{V_c \leq a\} \doteq 1 - \exp(-a\zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}).$$

We see from the results summarized in Table 1 that there is substantial variance reduction when importance sampling is used. The analytic approximations have also been shown to be quite accurate, lying within two standard errors of the importance sampling estimate in all the cases considered.

5.3 Proofs

We preface the proofs of Proposition 5 and Theorem 5 with the following preliminary lemmas. We shall let $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denote the greatest integer function. Let $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}, t}$ be the change of measure defined in the beginning of Section 5.2 and let $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} = P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}, 0}$.

Lemma 2 *Let $t \geq 0$ and $c > \mu_{\mathbf{w}}$. Then*

$$P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_t \geq c\} \sim (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} T^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. Let $E_{\theta,t}$ denote expectation with respect to the probability measure $P_{\theta,t}$. Let $I_T = [z_T, z_T + \varepsilon_T)$ with $\varepsilon_T = o(T^{-1/2})$. Then by (23) and (29),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbf{w}}\{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\} &= E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} \left[\frac{dP_{\mathbf{w}}}{dP_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}} \mathbf{1}_{\{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\}} \right] \\ &= e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} \left[e^{T\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(c - S_t)} \mathbf{1}_{\{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\}} \right] \\ (34) \quad &\sim e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) - T^{1/2}\theta_{\mathbf{w}} z_T} P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} \{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\}. \end{aligned}$$

By similar computations, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(35) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_t \geq c + y\} = e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} \left[e^{T\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(c - S_t)} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_t \geq c + y\}} \right] \leq e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) - T\theta_{\mathbf{w}} y}.$$

Under $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}$, $T S_t^{(i)}$ is compound Poisson with Poisson mean $\eta_i = \lambda_i \int_0^T e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du$ and each summand is identically distributed as $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i)$, where U_i is a random variable on $[0, T]$ with density $(\lambda_i/\eta_i) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)}$. We note that

$$E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} [g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i)] = (\lambda_i/\eta_i) \int_0^T g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du = \frac{d}{d\theta} \int_0^T \lambda_i e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du \Big|_{\theta=\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} / \eta_i.$$

Since $\theta_{\mathbf{w}}$ maximizes the right hand side of (23), it follows that

$$(36) \quad E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}[S_t] = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \eta_i E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}[g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i)] = T^{-1} \frac{d}{d\theta} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T (e^{\theta g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du \Big|_{\theta=\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} = c.$$

Since a compound Poisson $Y = \sum_{j=1}^N Y_j$ has variance $\text{Var}(Y) = (EN)(EY_1^2)$, it follows from (26) that

$$(37) \quad \text{Var}_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}(S_t) = T^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^d \eta_i \int_0^T [g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)]^2 (\lambda_i/\eta_i) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du = T^{-1} v_{\mathbf{w}}.$$

By (36) and (37), $T^{1/2}(S_t - c)$ is asymptotically normal with mean 0 and variance $v_{\mathbf{w}}$. Hence by equation (5) of Stone (1965),

$$(38) \quad P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}\{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\} = (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \int_{I_T} e^{-z^2/(2v_{\mathbf{w}})} dz + o_T(1)(\varepsilon_T + T^{-1/2}) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where $o_T(1)$ is a term not depending on ε_T and z_T . Let $\varepsilon_T T^{1/2}$ tend to 0 slowly enough such that $o_T(1)/(\varepsilon_T T^{1/2}) \rightarrow 0$. Then by (38),

$$(39) \quad P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}\{T^{1/2}(S_t - c) \in I_T\} \sim (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \int_{I_T} e^{-z^2/(2v_{\mathbf{w}})} dz \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

if I_T is uniformly bounded. Then by (34), (35) and (39),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_t \geq c\} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \varepsilon_T^{-1} \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}\{k\varepsilon_T \leq T^{1/2}(S_t - c) < (k+1)\varepsilon_T\} + P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_T \geq c + T^{-1/2}\} \\ &\sim (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \int_0^\infty e^{-T^{1/2}\theta_{\mathbf{w}}z - z^2/(2v_{\mathbf{w}})} dz \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 2 holds. $\square$

Lemma 3 *Assume (A1)-(A2). There exists $\varepsilon_T = o(T^{-1/2})$ such that for all uniformly bounded intervals $I_{1,T}, I_{2,T}$ of length ε_T ,*

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} &P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t}\left\{T^{1/2}\left(S_t - c, \frac{d}{dx}S_x\Big|_{x=t}\right) \in I_{1,T} \times I_{2,T}\right\} \\ &\sim (2\pi)^{-1}(v_{\mathbf{w}}\tau_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \left(\int_{z_1 \in I_{1,T}} e^{-z_1^2/(2v_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_1\right) \left(\int_{z_2 \in I_{2,T}} e^{-z_2^2/(2\tau_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_2\right), \end{aligned}$$

almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

PROOF. By stationarity, we may assume without loss of generality that $t = 0$. Under $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}$, the vector $(TS_0^{(i)}, T\frac{d}{dx}S_x^{(i)}|_{x=0})'$ is bivariate compound Poisson with Poisson mean $\eta_i = \lambda_i \int_0^T e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du$ and with each summand identically distributed as

$$(g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i), -\frac{d}{du}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)|_{u=U_i})',$$

where U_i is a random variable on $[0, T)$ with density $(\lambda_i/\eta_i)e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)}$. By (A2), $\frac{d}{dx}S_x^{(i)}|_{x=0}$ exists almost surely.

We shall now compute the means and covariances of

$$(S_0, \frac{d}{dx}S_x|_{x=0})' = \sum_{i=1}^d (S_0^{(i)}, \frac{d}{dx}S_x^{(i)}|_{x=0})'$$

under $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left[-\frac{d}{du}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)\Big|_{u=U_i}\right] &= -(\lambda_i/\eta_i) \int_0^T \left[\frac{d}{du}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)\right] e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du \\ &= -(\lambda_i/\eta_i)\theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1}(e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(T)} - e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(0)}), \end{aligned}$$

and $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ is bounded, it follows that

$$(41) \quad E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\frac{d}{dx}S_x\Big|_{x=0}\right] = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \eta_i E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left[-\frac{d}{du}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)\Big|_{u=U^{(i)}}\right] = O(T^{-1}).$$

The bivariate compound Poisson $(Y, Z)' = \sum_{j=1}^N (Y_j, Z_j)'$, where $(Y_1, Z_1)', \dots, (Y_N, Z_N)'$ are independent identically distributed summands conditioned on an independent Poisson random variable N , has covariance matrix

$$\text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} Y \\ Z \end{pmatrix} = E(N) \begin{pmatrix} E(Y^2) & E(YZ) \\ E(YZ) & E(Z^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from the relation

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} \left[g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i) \frac{d}{du} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) \Big|_{u=U_i} \right] &= (\lambda_i/\eta_i) \int_0^T \left[\frac{d}{du} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) \right] g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} du \\ &= (\lambda_i/\eta_i) [\theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-2}] e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} \Big|_{u=0}^{u=T} = O(T^{-1}) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

that

$$\text{Cov}_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}(S_0, \frac{d}{dx} S_x|_{x=0}) = -T^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^d \eta_i E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} [g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(U_i) \frac{d}{du} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)|_{u=U_i}] = O(T^{-2}) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and hence by (26),

$$(42) \quad \text{Cov}_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} \left(\begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ \frac{d}{dx} S_x|_{x=0} \end{pmatrix} \right) \sim T^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v_{\mathbf{w}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

It then follows from equation (5) of Stone (1965), (36), (41) and (42) that

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}},t} \{ T^{1/2} (S_t - c, \frac{d}{dx} S_x|_{x=t}) \in I_{1,T} \times I_{2,T} \} \\ &= (2\pi)^{-1} (v_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \left(\int_{z_1 \in I_{1,T}} e^{-z_1^2/(2v_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_1 \right) \left(\int_{z_2 \in I_{2,T}} e^{-z_2^2/(2\tau_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_2 \right) \\ &\quad + o_T(1)(\varepsilon_T^2 + T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $o_T(1)$ does not depend on $I_{j,T}$, $j = 1, 2$. Then Lemma 3 follows by selecting ε_T such that $\varepsilon_T T^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$ and $o_T(1)/\varepsilon_T^2 T \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

Lemma 4 *Let κ , T , K and c be positive constants. Let*

$$s(u) = c + z_1 T^{-1/2} + u z_2 T^{-1/2} - \frac{u^2}{2} K.$$

Then $\sup_{0 \leq u \leq \kappa T^{-1/2}} s(u) \geq \max\{c, s(0), s(\kappa T^{-1/2})\}$ if and only if $\kappa \geq z_2/K \geq 0$ and $z_1 \geq -z_2^2/(2KT^{1/2})$.

PROOF. Since the quadratic s has a unique maximum at $u = z_2/(KT^{1/2})$, it follows that if $\kappa \geq z_2/K \geq 0$, then

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq \kappa T^{-1/2}} s(u) = s\left(\frac{z_2}{KT^{1/2}}\right) = c + \frac{z_1}{T^{1/2}} + \frac{z_2^2}{2KT}$$

and Lemma 4 easily holds. $\square$

Lemma 5 *Assume (A1)-(A2). Then for any $\kappa > 0$, $t \geq 0$ and $c > \mu$,*

$$(43) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{t < u \leq t + \kappa T^{-1/2}} S_u \geq \max(c, S_t, S_{t+\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right\} \sim \kappa T^{-1/2} \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\zeta_{\mathbf{w}} = (2\pi)^{-1}(\tau_{\mathbf{w}}/v_{\mathbf{w}})^{1/2}$.

PROOF. Assume without loss of generality $t = 0$. Let $H_i (= H_{i,\mathbf{w}})$ be the set of all v such that a second derivative does not exist at $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)$. Note that by (A1)-(A2), the number of elements in H_i is $O(T)$ a.s. for all i . Let $0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}$ and let $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ be such that $y - h \notin (0, u)$ for all $h \in H_i$. Then by (A2) and the mean value theorem,

$$(44) \quad g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - u) - g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y) + u \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y} = \frac{u^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{dv^2} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=\xi}$$

for some $y - u \leq \xi \leq y$.

If $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ is such that $y - h \in (0, u)$ for some $h \in H_i \setminus \{0, T\}$, then

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} & g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - u) - g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y) + u \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y} \\ &= \int_{y-u}^y \left(\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y} - \frac{d}{d\xi} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(\xi) \right) d\xi \\ &= (h + u - y) \left(\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \downarrow h} - \frac{d}{d\xi} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \uparrow h} \right) + o(u^2). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for completeness, we consider $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ such that either $y - T \in (0, u)$ or $y \in (0, u)$. Then we write formally

$$(46) \quad g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - u) - g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y) + u \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y} = g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - u) - g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y) + u \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y}.$$

By adding up (44)-(46) over all $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$ and dividing by T , we obtain

$$(47) \quad S_u - S_0 - u \frac{d}{dv} S_v \Big|_{v=0} = -\frac{C_{\mathbf{w},u} u^2}{2},$$

where $C_{\mathbf{w},u}$ is an expression derived from the right hand sides of (44)-(46). It shall be shown in Appendix B that

$$(48) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}} u^2 T \left| C_{\mathbf{w},u} - \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}} \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s. under } P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}.$$

Then by Lemma 3, the change of variables

$$z_1 = T^{1/2}(S_0 - c) \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = T^{1/2} \frac{d}{dx} S_x \Big|_{x=0},$$

substituting $K = \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}}$ into Lemma 4, (47), (23) and (29),

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}} S_u \geq \max(c, S_0, S_{\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right\} \\ &= E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} \left[\frac{dP_{\mathbf{w}}}{dP_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}}(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}} S_u \geq \max(c, S_0, S_{\kappa T^{-1/2}})\}} \right] \\ &= e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} \left[e^{T\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(c-S_0)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}} S_u \geq \max(c, S_0, S_{\kappa T^{-1/2}})\}} \right] \\ &\sim e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} (2\pi)^{-1} (v_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \times \int_0^{\kappa \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}}} \int_{-z_2^2/(2\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}} T^{1/2})}^{\infty} e^{-T^{1/2} \theta_{\mathbf{w}} z_1 - z_1^2/2v_{\mathbf{w}} - z_2^2/2\tau_{\mathbf{w}}} dz_1 dz_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sim e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}(2\pi)^{-1}(v_{\mathbf{w}}\tau_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \times \int_0^{\kappa\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\tau_{\mathbf{w}}} e^{-z_2^2/2\tau_{\mathbf{w}}}(-T^{-1/2}\theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1}e^{-T^{1/2}\theta_{\mathbf{w}}z_1}) \Big|_{z_1=-z_2^2/(2\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\tau_{\mathbf{w}}T^{1/2})}^{z_1=\infty} dz_2, \end{aligned}$$

and indeed Lemma 5 holds. $\square$

The proof of the next lemma will also be shown in Appendix B.

Lemma 6 *Assume (A1)-(A2). Let*

$$A_t = \left\{ \sup_{t < u < t + \kappa T^{-1/2}} S_u \geq \max(c, S_t, S_{t+\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right\}.$$

Then there exists $r_\kappa = o(\kappa)$ as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, with probability 1,

$$(49) \quad \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq T^{3/2}/\kappa+1} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_t \cap A_{t+\ell\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \leq r_\kappa T^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}$$

for all large T .

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5. By stationarity, we may assume without loss of generality $t = 0$. By Lemmas 2, 5, 6 and the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor - 1} \left[P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1/2}}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor - 1 - q} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1/2}} \cap A_{(q+\ell)\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right] \\ &\leq P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq \Delta} S_u \geq c \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1/2}}) + \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor + 1} P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_{q\kappa T^{-1/2}} \geq c\}, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists κ arbitrarily large such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor - 1) \left[(1 - \varepsilon) \kappa T^{-1/2} \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} - r_\kappa T^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \right] \\ &\leq P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq \Delta} S_u \geq c \right\} \\ (50) \quad &\leq (\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor + 1)(1 + \varepsilon) \left[\kappa T^{-1/2} \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} + (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} T^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

holds for all large T with probability 1. Select κ large enough such that (50) and the inequalities

$$r_\kappa \leq \varepsilon \kappa \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}, \quad (2\pi v_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} \leq \varepsilon \kappa \zeta_{\mathbf{w}},$$

holds for all large T with probability 1. Then by (50), the inequality

$$(51) \quad \left| \frac{P_{\mathbf{w}}\{\sup_{0 < u \leq \Delta} S_u \geq c\}}{\Delta \zeta_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}} - 1 \right| \leq 3\varepsilon$$

holds for all large T with probability 1 and (27) follows from (51) by selecting $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 5. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\xi (= \xi_{\mathbf{w}})$ be such that $\xi/T \rightarrow \infty$ and $k (= k_{\mathbf{w}}) := ze^{T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}/\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}\xi$ is a positive integer tending to infinity almost surely. Define $B_j = \{\sup_{(j-1)\xi \leq t < j\xi - T} S_t \geq c\}$ and $C_j = \{\sup_{j\xi - T \leq t \leq j\xi} S_t \geq c\}$. Then

$$(52) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k B_j\right) \leq P_{\mathbf{w}}\{\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}V_c \leq z\} \leq P_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k B_j\right) + \sum_{j=1}^k P_{\mathbf{w}}(C_j).$$

Conditioned on $\mathbf{w}$ known, the event B_j depends only on the spike train times of $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ lying inside $[(j-1)\xi, j\xi)$. Since these intervals are disjoint for different j , it follows that $B_1, \dots, B_k$ are independent conditioned on $\mathbf{w}$. By Lemmas 5 and 6, it follows that with probability 1,

$$(53) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}(B_j) \sim (\xi - T)\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \sim z/k, \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}(C_j) \sim T\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Since $k \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. as $T \rightarrow \infty$, with probability 1,

$$(54) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k B_j\right) = 1 - \prod_{j=1}^k P_{\mathbf{w}}(B_j^c) = 1 - (1 - z/k)^k + o(1) \rightarrow 1 - e^{-z}.$$

Moreover because $\xi/T \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (53) that with probability 1,

$$(55) \quad \sum_{j=1}^k P_{\mathbf{w}}(C_j) \sim Tk\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} = o(1).$$

Theorem 5(a) follows from (52), (54) and (55).

To show Theorem 5(b), we use the Taylor expansion

$$(56) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathbf{w}}\left(c_{\mathbf{w}} + \frac{z + \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}}{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}T}\right) &= \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c_{\mathbf{w}}) + \theta_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\frac{z + \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}}{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}T}\right) + O(T^{-2}) \\ &= T^{-1}[z + \log(a\zeta_{\mathbf{w}})] + O(T^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

By the computations in (52)-(55), it follows that with probability 1,

$$(57) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{\mathbf{w}}\left\{M_a \geq c_{\mathbf{w}} + \frac{z + \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}}{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}T}\right\} &= P_{\mathbf{w}}\{V_{c_{\mathbf{w}} + [z + \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}]/(\theta_{\mathbf{w}}T)} \leq a\} \\ &= 1 - \exp\left[-a\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c_{\mathbf{w}} + [z + \log \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}]/(\theta_{\mathbf{w}}T))} + o(1)\right], \end{aligned}$$

and Theorem 5(b) follows by substituting (56) into (57).

It remains to show (c). Let $\tilde{U}_a = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor a/\xi \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{B_j}$. Then by (53), $E_{\mathbf{w}}[\tilde{U}_a] - \eta_{\mathbf{w}} \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and (28) holds with U_a replaced by $\tilde{U}_a$, since B_j , $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor a/\xi \rfloor$ are independent events and the limit of sum of binomial random variables is Poisson. By (53) and (55),

$$(58) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor a/\xi \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(C_j) = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor a/\xi \rfloor - 1} P_{\mathbf{w}}(B_j \cap B_{j+1}) = o(1) \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 6, with probability 1,

$$(59) \quad \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \alpha/(\kappa T^{-1/2}) \rfloor} \left[\sum_{\ell=\lfloor (1-\alpha)T^{3/2}/\kappa \rfloor}^{\lfloor T^{3/2}/\kappa+1 \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1/2}} \cap A_{(q+\ell)\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right] \leq \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{w}} r \kappa}{\kappa \zeta_{\mathbf{w}}}$$

for all large T , where αT is the maximal permitted overlap between two matches. By (58) and (59) with κ arbitrarily large, we can conclude that $\tilde{U}_a - U_a \rightarrow 0$ in probability and hence (28) holds. $\square$

6 Template matching with kernels containing discontinuities

In this section, we obtain analogues of Proposition 5 and Theorem 5 when the score function f contains discontinuities. A typical example is the box kernel

$$(60) \quad f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < \varepsilon, \\ -\beta & \text{if } x \geq \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where β, ε are positive real numbers. Instead of (A2), we have the following regularity condition on f .

(A2)' Let f be a discontinuous function and let there be a finite set H such that the first derivative of f exists and is uniformly continuous over any interval within $\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus H$. Moreover, (22) holds.

Under (A2)', the values of f may be concentrated on $0, \pm q, \pm 2q, \dots$ for some $q > 0$.

DEFINITION. Let $L(f) = \{f(x) : x \geq 0\}$ be the range of f . We say that f is arithmetic if

$$(61) \quad L(f) \subseteq q\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for some } q > 0.$$

Moreover, if q is the largest number satisfying (61), then we say that f is arithmetic with span q . If (61) is not satisfied for all $q > 0$, we say that f is nonarithmetic.

For example, if β in (60) is irrational, then f is nonarithmetic while if $\beta = s/r$ for co-primes r and s , then f is arithmetic with span $q = r^{-1}$. We write for $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+) &= \lim_{v \downarrow u} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v), \\ g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-) &= \lim_{v \uparrow u} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v), \\ \delta_i(u) &= g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-) - g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+), \\ D_i &= \{u \in (0, T) : \delta_i(u) \neq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ is as in (21).

Let $\phi_{\mathbf{w}}, \theta_{\mathbf{w}}, v_{\mathbf{w}}$ and μ be as in Section 5.1. If $D_i \neq \emptyset$ for some i , we can define $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ to be the probability mass function taking values in $\{\delta_i(u)\}_{u \in D_i, 1 \leq i \leq d}$ with

$$(62) \quad h_{\mathbf{w}}^*(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta_i(u)=x\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-)}}.$$

Let E_* denotes expectation when $X_1, X_2, \dots$ are independent identically distributed random variables with probability mass function $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$. Define

$$(63) \quad \omega_b = \inf\{n : X_1 + \dots + X_n \geq b\} \quad \text{and} \quad R_b = X_1 + \dots + X_{\omega_b}.$$

Then the overshoot constant

$$(64) \quad \nu_{\mathbf{w}} := \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_* e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(R_b - b)},$$

where b is taken to be a multiple of χ if $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ is arithmetic with span χ . Note that the statement “ $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ is arithmetic with span χ ” implies that $\{\delta_i(u)\}_{u \in D_i, 1 \leq i \leq d} \subset \chi\mathbb{Z}$. The constants $\nu_{\mathbf{w}}$ have been well-studied in sequential analysis, see for example Siegmund (1985) for the existence of the limits in (64). Let us define the asymptotic constant $\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}$ (not depending on $\mathbf{y}$) by

$$(65) \quad \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} = (2\pi T \nu_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \nu_{\mathbf{w}} K_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} \delta_i(u) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-)},$$

where

$$K_{\mathbf{w}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } h_{\mathbf{w}}^* \text{ is nonarithmetic,} \\ \frac{1}{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \chi} (1 - e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \chi}) & \text{if } h_{\mathbf{w}}^* \text{ is arithmetic with span } \chi, f \text{ is nonarithmetic,} \\ \frac{q}{\chi} \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \chi}}{1 - e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}} q}} \right) & \text{if } h_{\mathbf{w}}^* \text{ is arithmetic with span } \chi, f \text{ is arithmetic with span } q. \end{cases}$$

Since we can express each $\delta_i(u)$, $u \in D_i$ in the form $g_1 - g_2$ for $g_1, g_2 \in L(f)$, it follows that if f is arithmetic, then $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ is arithmetic and χ/q is a positive integer. Analogous to Lemma 5 and Theorem 5, we have the following asymptotic results.

Proposition 6 *Assume (A1), (A2)' and let $\Delta > 0$, $t \geq 0$. If f is nonarithmetic and $c > \mu$, then*

$$(66) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{t < u \leq t + \Delta} S_u \geq c \right\} \sim \Delta \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

If f is arithmetic with span q , then (66) also holds under the convention that

$$(67) \quad Tc (= Tc_T) \in q\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{with } c \rightarrow c' \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some } c' > \mu.$$

Theorem 6 *Assume (A1) and (A2)' and let f be nonarithmetic.*

(a) *Let $c > \mu$. Then the distribution (conditional on $\mathbf{w}$) of $\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} V_c$ converges to the exponential distribution with mean 1 almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$.*

(b) *Let $a \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(\log a)/T$ converges to a positive constant. Let $c_{\mathbf{w}} > \mu_{\mathbf{w}}$ satisfy $\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c_{\mathbf{w}}) = (\log a)/T$. Then for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$P_{\mathbf{w}} \{ \theta_{\mathbf{w}} T (M_a - c_{\mathbf{w}}) - \log \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} \geq z \} \rightarrow 1 - \exp(-e^{-z}) \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

(c) *Let $a \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(\log a)/T$ converges to a positive constant. Let $c (= c_T)$ be such that $\eta_{\mathbf{w}} := a \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}$ converges to a constant $\eta > 0$ almost surely. Then*

$$(68) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}} \{ U_a = k \} - e^{-\eta_{\mathbf{w}}} \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{w}}^k}{k!} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s. } \forall k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

If f is arithmetic with span q , then (a) and (c) also hold under the convention (67).

TABLE 2. Estimates of $P_{\mathbf{w}}\{M_a \geq c\} \pm$ standard error with $a + T = 20s$.

c	Direct MC	Imp. Sampling	Anal. Approx. (69)
0.065	0.029 $\pm$ 0.004	0.0300 $\pm$ 0.0016	0.0289
0.066	0.019 $\pm$ 0.003	0.0218 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.0207
0.067	0.012 $\pm$ 0.002	0.0140 $\pm$ 0.0008	0.0144
0.068	0.008 $\pm$ 0.002	0.0103 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.0101
0.069	0.005 $\pm$ 0.002	0.0067 $\pm$ 0.0004	0.0070
0.070	0.003 $\pm$ 0.001	0.0051 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.0047

EXAMPLE 2. We shall conduct here a simulation study similar to Example 1. The generation of $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are similar to Example 1 but the box kernel (60) is used instead of the Hamming window function (31) when computing $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$. We chose parameters $\varepsilon = 4\text{ms}$ and $\beta = 0.3$ in (60). Hence f is arithmetic with span $q = 0.1$ and $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ is arithmetic with span $\chi = 1.3$. In fact, $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ is positive only on the values -1.3 and 1.3 and hence $\nu_{\mathbf{w}} = 1$. In the template $\mathbf{w}$ that was generated, there were a total of 2×59 elements in $\bigcup_i D_i$ with half of all $u \in D_i$ satisfying $\delta_i(u) = 1.3$ and the other half satisfying $\delta_i(u) = -1.3$ for each i . Hence

$$h_{\mathbf{w}}^*(-1.3) = e^{-0.3\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} / (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} + e^{-0.3\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}) \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\mathbf{w}}^*(1.3) = e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} / (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}} + e^{-0.3\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}).$$

These information are then used in the computation of the constant $\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}$ in the analytical approximation

$$(69) \quad P_{\mathbf{w}}\{M_a \geq c\} = P_{\mathbf{w}}\{V_c \leq a\} \doteq 1 - \exp(-a\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}),$$

an analogue of (33) that follows from Theorem 6(a).

In Table 2, we compare the analytical approximation (69) against both direct Monte Carlo and importance sampling with 2000 simulation runs being used to obtain each entry. The variance reduction when importance sampling is used is similar to that seen in Example 1, and the technique is indeed an effective time saving device for computing p -values especially when the p -values are small. The analytic approximations are also accurate and agree with the simulation results that were obtained.

In addition to the above simulation study, we also conducted a similar exercise to check the accuracy of the Poisson approximation of U_a in (68), this time with $a + T = 200s$ and threshold level $c = 0.0614$. The maximal proportion of overlap between two matches is chosen to be $\alpha = 0.8$. The analytical approximations are compared against 2000 direct Monte Carlo simulation runs and the results are recorded in Table 3. Again we see that the analytical approximations are quite accurate and this indicates the usefulness of using the asymptotic results in Theorem 6 to estimate p -values.

We shall now prove Proposition 6 and Theorem 6 via the following preliminary lemmas. Let

$$(70) \quad h_{\mathbf{w}}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta_i(u)=x\}} / \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+)}.$$

Then $h_{\mathbf{w}}$ and $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$ [see (62)] are conjugate probability mass functions in the following sense.

TABLE 3. Estimates of $P_{\mathbf{w}}\{U_a = k\}$ and $\eta_{\mathbf{w}} = E_{\mathbf{w}}(U_a)$. Standard errors in parentheses.

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	≥ 6	$\eta_{\mathbf{w}}$
Approx. (68)	0.336	0.366	0.200	0.073	0.020	0.004	0.001	1.09
Direct Monte Carlo	0.328 (0.011)	0.363 (0.011)	0.195 (0.009)	0.084 (0.006)	0.024 (0.003)	0.005 (0.002)	0.001 (0.001)	1.13 (0.02)

Lemma 7 *Let $D_i \neq \emptyset$ for some i . Then there exists $\gamma_{\mathbf{w}} = 1 + O(T^{-1})$ a.s. such that*

$$h_{\mathbf{w}}^*(x) = \gamma_{\mathbf{w}} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} x} h_{\mathbf{w}}(x) \quad \forall x.$$

PROOF. Let $u \in D_i$ with $w_j^{(i)} < u < w_{j+1}^{(i)}$ for adjacent spikes $w_j^{(i)}, w_{j+1}^{(i)} \in \mathbf{w}^{(i)}$. Then by the symmetry of $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ in the interval $(w_j^{(i)}, w_{j+1}^{(i)})$ about its mid-point $(w_j^{(i)} + w_{j+1}^{(i)})/2$, it follows that $v := w_{j+1}^{(i)} - (y - w_j^{(i)}) \in D_i$ and that $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v-) = g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+)$. Hence $\gamma_{\mathbf{w}}$, which we define here to be the ratio of the denominators on the right-hand sides of (62) and (70), is $1 + O(T^{-1})$ a.s. with the $O(T^{-1})$ coming from $u \in D_i$ occurring before the first spike or after the last spike in $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}$. Since

$$e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta_i(u)=x\}} = e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} [x + g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+)]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta_i(u)=x\}},$$

Lemma 7 holds. $\square$

Lemma 8 *Assume (A1), (A2)' and let $\kappa > 0$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists κ large enough such that for any $t \geq 0$, the inequality*

$$\left| \frac{P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_t < c, \sup_{t < u \leq t + \kappa T^{-1}} S_u \geq c\}}{\kappa T^{-1} \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon,$$

holds for all large T with probability 1, where the constant $\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}$ is defined in (65) and $c > \mu$ if f is nonarithmetic; c satisfies (67) if f is arithmetic with span q .

PROOF. Assume without loss of generality $t = 0$ and let $G_i = \bigcup_{v \in D_i} (v, v + \kappa T^{-1}]$. We can write $TS_0 = TS'_0 + J_0$, where

$$S'_0 = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}, y \notin G_i} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y) \text{ and } J_0 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap G_i} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y).$$

The random variables S'_0 and J_0 are independent because they are functions of the Poisson processes $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ over disjoint subsets of the real line. Let us first consider f arithmetic with span q . Then TS'_0 and J_0 are both integral multiples of q . Since f is constant between jumps, we can express $TS_u = TS'_0 + J_u$ [see (20)] where

$$(71) \quad J_u = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap G_i} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(y - u) \quad \forall u \in (0, \kappa T^{-1}).$$

Hence both $S_0 < c$ and $\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} S_u \geq c$ occurs if and only if

$$(72) \quad \sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} (J_u - J_0) \geq \ell q \text{ and } S'_0 = c - T^{-1} k q \text{ for some integer } \ell \geq 1 \text{ and } k = J_0/q + \ell.$$

Since $E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}[S'_0] = c + O(T^{-1})$ a.s., by the local limit theorem for lattice random variables [see, for example, Theorem 15.5.3 of Feller (1971)],

$$(73) \quad P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\{S'_0 = c - T^{-1} k q\} \sim \frac{q}{(2\pi T v_{\mathbf{w}})^{1/2}} \text{ a.s.}$$

for any integer k . Since S'_0 and $(J_u)_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}}$ are independent, it follows from (72), (73), (23) and the change of measure (29) that

$$(74) \quad \begin{aligned} & P_{\mathbf{w}}\left\{S_0 < c, \sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} S_u \geq c\right\} \\ &= E_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\frac{dP_{\mathbf{w}}}{dP_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}}(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\{S_0 < c, \sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} S_u \geq c\}}\right] \\ &\sim \frac{q}{(2\pi T v_{\mathbf{w}})^{1/2}} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \ell q} P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left\{\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} (J_u - J_0) \geq \ell q\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ is constant between jumps, the graph of $(J_u - J_0)$ against u is also piecewise constant with jumps at all u for which $y - u \in D_i$ for some $y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ [see (71)]. Let N_* be the total number of spikes in $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq d} (\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \cap G_i)$. Then there are N_* such jumps and

$$\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} (J_u - J_0) = \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_*} (X_1 + \cdots + X_j)$$

where X_j is the j th jump and has probability mass function $h_{\mathbf{w}}$. Moreover, $X_1, X_2, \dots$ are independent conditioned on N_* , a Poisson random variable independent of the X_i 's with mean

$$(75) \quad EN_* = \kappa T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{u \in D_i} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u+)}.$$

If $r \in \{0, \dots, \chi/q - 1\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then $R_{s\chi - rq} = R_{s\chi}$ [see (63)]. Let E_* and P_* denote the expectation and probability measure respectively when $X_1, X_2, \dots$ are independent identically distributed with probability mass function $h_{\mathbf{w}}^*$. Then it follows from a change of measure to P_* and Lemma 7 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} \ell q} P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}\left\{\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa T^{-1}} (J_u - J_0) \geq \ell q\right\} \\ &= \gamma_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} E_*\left[e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(R_{\ell q} - \ell q)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_*} (X_1 + \cdots + X_j) \geq \ell q\}}\right] \\ &= \gamma_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1} E_*\left[\sum_{r=0}^{\chi/q-1} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}}[R_{s\chi} - (s\chi - rq)]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_*} (X_1 + \cdots + X_j) \geq s\chi\}}\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$(76) \quad \sim \chi^{-1} \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\chi/q-1} e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}} r q} \right) \nu_{\mathbf{w}} E_* \left[\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_*} (X_1 + \cdots + X_j) \right].$$

Since X_i has positive mean under P_* for all large T and the almost sure limit of $E_* N$ [see (75)] is proportional to κ , it follows that there exists κ large enough such that

$$(77) \quad \left| \frac{E_* [\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_*} (X_1 + \cdots + X_j)]}{(E N_*) (E_* X_1)} - 1 \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for all large T . Since $(q/\chi) \sum_{r=0}^{\chi/q-1} e^{-\theta_{\mathbf{w}} r q} = K_{\mathbf{w}}$, Lemma 8 then follows from (62) and (74) to (77). When f is nonarithmetic, the local limit result (40) with $I_{2,T} = \mathbb{R}$ and $t = 0$ is used in place of (73). $\square$.

The next lemma, needed for the proofs of both Proposition 6 and Theorem 6, will be proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 9 *Assume (A1) and (A2)'. Let*

$$A_t = \left\{ S_t < c, \quad \sup_{t < u \leq t + \kappa T^{-1}} S_u \geq c \right\}.$$

Then there exists $r_\kappa = o(\kappa)$ as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, with probability 1,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T^2/\kappa+1 \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_t \cap A_{t+\ell\kappa T^{-1}}) \leq r_\kappa T^{-1/2} e^{-T\phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c)}$$

for all large T .

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6. By stationarity, we may assume without loss of generality $t = 0$. Then (66) follows from Lemmas 2, 8, 9 and the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1}) \rfloor - 1} \left[P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1}}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1}) \rfloor - 1 - q} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1}} \cap A_{(q+\ell)\kappa T^{-1}}) \right] \\ & \leq P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq \Delta} S_u \geq c \right\} \leq \sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor \Delta/(\kappa T^{-1}) \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1}}) + P_{\mathbf{w}}\{S_0 \geq c\}, \end{aligned}$$

with κ arbitrarily large; see for example, the proof of Proposition 5. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 6. The proof of Theorem 6 proceeds as in the proof of Theorem 5. The only modification needed is the replacement of $\zeta_{\mathbf{w}}$ by $\zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}$. For the proof of Theorem 6(c), we will also need to replace (59) by

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\lfloor a/(\kappa T^{-1}) \rfloor} \left[\sum_{\ell=\lfloor (1-\alpha)T^2/\kappa \rfloor}^{\lfloor T^2/\kappa+1 \rfloor} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_{q\kappa T^{-1}} \cap A_{(q+\ell)\kappa T^{-1}}) \right] \leq \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{w}} r_\kappa T^{1/2}}{\kappa \zeta'_{\mathbf{w}}}.$$

$\square$

7 Acknowledgments

Wei-Liem Loh would like to thank Professor Yannis Yatracos for the many discussions on metric entropy and minimum distance estimation and to Professor Zhiyi Chi for introducing to him the field of neuroscience when he visited the University of Chicago in Spring 2003.

8 Appendix A

Lemma 10 *Let $\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2$ and $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}$ be as in Section 2. Then for each $(s_1, r_1) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2$,*

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T}^* \sup_{\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon, (s_2, r_2) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2} [p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - p_{s_2, r_2}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \dots dw_j \right\}^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon C_{\tilde{\kappa}},$$

where $C_{\tilde{\kappa}} \geq 1/2$ is a constant depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$. Here $\int^*$ denotes the upper integral [see for example Dudley (1999), page 94]. Consequently,

$$(78) \quad H^B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq H\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2C_{\tilde{\kappa}}}, \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2, \rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}\right) \leq \frac{2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q}}{\varepsilon^{1/q}}.$$

PROOF. Let $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_0 \vee 1$. We observe from (2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - p_{s_2, r_2}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})| \\ &= |e^{-\int_0^T s_1(t)r_1(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2} \prod_{i=1}^j s_1^{1/2}(w_i)r_1^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1}) \\ &\quad - e^{-\int_0^T s_2(t)r_2(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2} \prod_{i=1}^j s_2^{1/2}(w_i)r_2^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1})|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta(t) = \max\{k \geq 0 : w_k < t\}$. Since $\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$|s_1^{1/2}(w_i)r_1^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1}) - s_2^{1/2}(w_i)r_2^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1})| \leq 2\varepsilon\bar{\kappa}, \quad \forall i \geq 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |e^{-\int_0^T s_1(t)r_1(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2} - e^{-\int_0^T s_2(t)r_2(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2}| \\ &\leq |1 - e^{\int_0^T [s_1(t)r_1(t-w_{\zeta(t)}) - s_2(t)r_2(t-w_{\zeta(t)})]dt/2}| \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon\bar{\kappa}^3 T \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\varepsilon\bar{\kappa}^3 T)^i}{(i+1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently for $j = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T}^* \sup_{\rho_{\Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon, (s_2, r_2) \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}^2} [e^{-\int_0^T s_1(t)r_1(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2} - e^{-\int_0^T s_2(t)r_2(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt/2}]^2 dw_1 \dots dw_j$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \prod_{i=1}^j s_1^{1/2}(w_i) r_1^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1}) \\
& - e^{-\int_0^T s_2(t) r_2(t - w_{\zeta(t)}) dt/2} \prod_{i=1}^j s_2^{1/2}(w_i) r_2^{1/2}(w_i - w_{i-1})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
& \leq [2\varepsilon \bar{\kappa}^{2j+3} T \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\varepsilon \bar{\kappa}^3 T)^i}{(i+1)!} + 2j\varepsilon \bar{\kappa}^{2j-1}]^2 \frac{T^j}{j!},
\end{aligned}$$

and for each $(s_1, r_1) \in \Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}^2(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \cdots < w_j < T}^* \sup_{\rho_{\Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}^2}((s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2)) \leq \varepsilon, (s_2, r_2) \in \Theta_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}^2} [p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - p_{s_2, r_2}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq \varepsilon \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [2\bar{\kappa}^{2j+3} T \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\varepsilon \bar{\kappa}^3 T)^i}{(i+1)!} + 2j\bar{\kappa}^{2j-1}]^2 \frac{T^j}{j!} \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq \varepsilon C_{\bar{\kappa}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\bar{\kappa}}$ is a absolute constant depending only on $\bar{\kappa}$. (78) now follows from Lemma 2.1 of Ossiander (1987) and (7) since $C_{\bar{\kappa}} \geq 1/2$. $\square$

Lemma 11 *With the notation of Section 2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
H^B(\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}, \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}}) & \leq H^B\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\kappa}, q, n}}\right) \\
& \leq 2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\bar{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\bar{\kappa}, q} \left(\frac{2e^{\tau/2}}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/q}, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. For $i = 1, 2$, let $f_i : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow R$ be a nonnegative function such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \cdots < w_j < T} f_i(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) dw_1 \cdots dw_j < \infty.$$

Define for $j = 0, 1, \dots$,

$$A_{i,j} = \{\{w_1, \dots, w_j\} : f_i(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) < e^{-\tau} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})\},$$

and

$$\tilde{f}_i(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) = \begin{cases} f_i(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}), & \text{on } A_{i,j}^c, \\ e^{-\tau} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}), & \text{on } A_{i,j}. \end{cases}$$

Letting $\tilde{Z}_{f_i}$ as in (8), we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \cdots < w_j < T} [\tilde{Z}_{f_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - \tilde{Z}_{f_2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
= & 4 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} \left[\log\left(\frac{\tilde{f}_1^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s,r}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}\right) - \log\left(\frac{\tilde{f}_2^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s,r}^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}\right) \right]^2 \\
& \times p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
\leq & 4e^\tau \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [\tilde{f}_1^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - \tilde{f}_2^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j.
\end{aligned}$$

By dividing the integral into four parts: namely $A_{1,j} \cap A_{2,j}, A_{1,j}^c \cap A_{2,j}, A_{1,j} \cap A_{2,j}^c$ and $A_{1,j}^c \cap A_{2,j}^c$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [\tilde{f}_1^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - \tilde{f}_2^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
\leq & \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [f_1^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - f_2^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [\tilde{Z}_{f_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - \tilde{Z}_{f_2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) dw_1 \cdots dw_j \right\}^{1/2} \\
\leq & 2e^{\tau/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} [f_1^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) - f_2^{1/2}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})]^2 dw_1 \cdots dw_j \right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11 now follows from Lemma 10. $\square$

The statement of the next lemma can be found in Wong and Shen (1995), page 346, but its proof is not provided there.

Lemma 12 (A Bernstein-type inequality) *Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ be independent identically distributed random variables satisfying*

$$E(|Z_1|^j) \leq \frac{j! b^{j-2} \gamma}{2}, \quad \forall j \geq 2.$$

Then

$$P\left[\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - EZ_i) \geq t\right] \leq \exp\left[-\frac{t^2}{4(2\gamma + b t n^{-1/2})}\right], \quad \forall t > 0.$$

PROOF. The following proof is an adaption of the proof given in Bennett (1962), pages 36 to 38. Let $c > 0$ be a suitably chosen constant and $\text{Var}(Z_i) = \sigma^2$. Then

$$E(e^{c(Z_i - EZ_i)}) = 1 + c^2 \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{c^{j-2} E[(Z_i - EZ_i)^j]}{j!} = 1 + c^2 F, \quad \text{say.}$$

Since $1 + c^2 F \leq e^{c^2 F}$, we have

$$E\{\exp[c \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - EZ_i)]\} \leq e^{nc^2 F}.$$

Hence it follows from Markov's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} P[\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - EZ_i) \geq t\sqrt{n}] &\leq e^{-ct\sqrt{n}} E e^{c \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - EZ_i)} \\ &\leq e^{c^2 n F - ct\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq e^{-t^2/(4F)}, \end{aligned}$$

by choosing c such that $F = t/(2cn^{1/2})$. Now for $j \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |E(Z_1 - EZ_1)^j| &\leq E(|Z_1 - EZ_1|^j) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^j \frac{j!}{i!(j-i)!} (E|Z_1|^i)(E|Z_1|^{j-i}) \\ &\leq 2^j E(|Z_1|^j) \\ &\leq j! 2^{j-1} b^{j-2} \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $2bc < 1$,

$$F \leq 2\gamma \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} (2bc)^{j-2} = \frac{2\gamma}{1-2bc}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{t}{2cn^{1/2}} \leq \frac{2\gamma}{1-2bc},$$

and consequently

$$c \geq \frac{t}{4\gamma n^{1/2} + 2bt}.$$

By taking

$$c = \frac{t}{4\gamma n^{1/2} + 2bt},$$

we observe that $2bc < 1$ and

$$P[\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - EZ_i) \geq t] \leq \exp[-\frac{t^2}{4(2\gamma + b t n^{-1/2})}].$$

This proves Lemma 12. □

For $g : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow R$, let

$$(79) \quad \nu_n(g) = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\}) - E_{s,r} g(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\})],$$

assuming that the right hand side exists and $\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,N_i(T)}\}$ is as in Section 3. We observe from Lemma 6 of Wong and Shen (1995) that

$$(80) \quad P_{s,r}[\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_f) \geq t] \leq \exp\left[-\frac{t^2}{8(8c_0\|f^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 + 2tn^{-1/2})}\right], \quad \forall t > 0,$$

where $\tilde{Z}_f$ is as in (8),

$$c_0 = (e^{\tau/2} - 1 - \frac{\tau}{2}) / (1 - e^{-\tau/2})^2.$$

The next lemma is motivated by Theorem 3 of Shen and Wong (1994) and Lemma 7 of Wong and Shen (1995). As the proof of the latter lemma is only briefly sketched in Wong and Shen (1995), page 348, a detailed proof of Lemma 13 is given below.

Lemma 13 *For any $t > 0, 0 < \gamma < 1$ and $M > 0$, let*

$$\psi(M, t^2, n) = \frac{M^2}{16(8c_0t^2 + Mn^{-1/2})}.$$

Assume that

$$(81) \quad H^B\left(\frac{t}{10}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \leq \frac{\gamma}{4}\psi(M, t^2, n),$$

$$(82) \quad \int_{\gamma M/(32n^{1/2})}^{e^{\tau/2}t/5} [H^B\left(\frac{x}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right)]^{1/2} dx \leq \frac{M\gamma^{3/2}}{2^{10}}.$$

Then

$$P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}) \geq M \right] \leq 3e^{-(1-\gamma)\psi(M, t^2, n)},$$

where $\nu_n(\cdot)$ is as in (79).

PROOF. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$(83) \quad 3e^{-(1-\gamma)\psi(M, t^2, n)} \leq 1,$$

else Lemma 13 is trivial. We observe from Lemma 11 that

$$H^B(\gamma, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq H^B\left(\frac{\gamma}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) < \infty.$$

For any $\delta_{n,0} > \delta_{n,1} > \dots > \delta_{n,n_0} > 0$, there exist $\mathcal{F}_{n,j}, j = 0, \dots, n_0$, with

$$|\mathcal{F}_{n,j}| = \exp[H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,j}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})],$$

such that for each $p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ one can find $f_j^L, f_j^U \in \mathcal{F}_{n,j}$ such that

$$f_j^L(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) \leq p_{s_1,r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) \leq f_j^U(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), \quad \text{a. s.,}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_{j_1} < T} [\tilde{Z}_{f_j^U}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{j_1}\}) - \tilde{Z}_{f_j^L}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{j_1}\})]^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{j_1}\}) dw_1 \dots dw_{j_1} \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq 2e^{\tau/2} \left\{ \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_{j_1} < T} [f_j^U(\{w_1, \dots, w_{j_1}\})^{1/2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - f_j^L(\{w_1, \dots, w_{j_1}\})^{1/2}]^2 dw_1 \dots dw_{j_1} \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq \delta_{n,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here n_0 is a nonnegative integer to be suitably chosen later. Define for $k = 0, \dots, n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
u_k(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) &= \min_{0 \leq j \leq k} f_j^U(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}), \\
l_k(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}) &= \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} f_j^L(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\tilde{Z}_{l_k} \leq \tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}} \leq \tilde{Z}_{u_k}$, $0 \leq \tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_{k+1}} \leq \tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k}$ a. s., and

$$[E_{s,r}(\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k})^2]^{1/2} \leq [E_{s,r}(\tilde{Z}_{f_k^U} - \tilde{Z}_{f_k^L})^2]^{1/2} \leq \delta_{n,k}, \quad \forall k = 0, \dots, n_0.$$

If $n_0 = 0$, define $B_0 = \mathcal{N}$. If $n_0 \geq 1$, let $a_1 > a_2 > \dots > 0$ be a sequence of constants and define

$$\begin{aligned}
B_0 &= \{\tilde{Z}_{u_0} - \tilde{Z}_{l_0} \geq a_1\}, \\
B_k &= \{\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k} \geq a_{k+1}, \tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{l_j} < a_{j+1}, j = 0, \dots, k-1\}, \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, n_0 - 1, \\
B_{n_0} &= (\cup_{k=0}^{n_0-1} B_k)^c.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{B_k : k = 0, \dots, n_0\}$ forms a partition of $\mathcal{N}$. Consequently writing $\mathbf{1}_{B_k}$ to denote the indicator function of B_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}} &= \tilde{Z}_{u_0} + \sum_{k=0}^{n_0} (\tilde{Z}_{u_k} \mathbf{1}_{B_k} - \tilde{Z}_{u_0} \mathbf{1}_{B_k}) + \tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}} - \sum_{k=0}^{n_0} \tilde{Z}_{u_k} \mathbf{1}_{B_k} \\
&= \tilde{Z}_{u_0} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} (\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n_0} (\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k}) \mathbf{1}_{B_k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n_0+1}$ be strictly positive constants such that $2\eta_1 + \dots + 2\eta_{n_0} + \eta_{n_0+1} \leq \gamma M/8$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}}) \geq M \right] \\
& \leq P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{u_0}) \geq M - \frac{\gamma M}{4} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_0} (\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k} \right) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} \eta_j \right] \\
& +P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n_0} (\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k}) \mathbf{1}_{B_k} \right) \geq \frac{\gamma M}{8} + \sum_{k=1}^{n_0+1} \eta_k \right] \\
\leq & |\mathcal{F}_{n,0}| \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r} [\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{u_0}) \geq M - \frac{\gamma M}{4}] \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}) \geq \eta_j \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{n_0-1} P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k}) \mathbf{1}_{B_k}) \geq \eta_{k+1} \right] \\
& + P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}}) \mathbf{1}_{B_{n_0}}) \geq \frac{\gamma M}{8} + \eta_{n_0+1} \right] \\
\leq & |\mathcal{F}_{n,0}| \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r} [\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{u_0}) \geq M - \frac{\gamma M}{4}] \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} \left(\prod_{l=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{n,l}| \right) \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r} [\nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}) \geq \eta_j] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{n_0-1} P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k}) \mathbf{1}_{B_k}) \geq \eta_{k+1} \right] \\
(84) \quad & + P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}}) \mathbf{1}_{B_{n_0}}) \geq \frac{\gamma M}{8} + \eta_{n_0+1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since H^B may be replaced by a larger continuous function at the expense of an arbitrarily small increase in these values, we shall follow Alexander (1984), page 1045, and assume for the rest of this proof that $H^B(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})$ is continuous and strictly decreasing from ∞ to 0 on $(0, a]$ for some a . We define

$$\delta_{n,0} = \inf \{x : H^B(\frac{x}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \leq \frac{\gamma}{4} \psi(M, t^2, n)\}.$$

CASE 1. Suppose that $\delta_{n,0} > \gamma M / (8n^{1/2})$. Then we further define

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{n,j} &= \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma M}{8n^{1/2}}, \sup \left\{ x \leq \frac{\delta_{n,j-1}}{2} : H^B(\frac{x}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \geq \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. 4H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,j-1}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) \right\} \right\}, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, \\
n_0 &= \min \{j : \delta_{n,j} = \frac{\gamma M}{8n^{1/2}}\}, \\
\eta_j &= 4\delta_{n,j-1} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=0}^j H^B(\delta_{n,i} e^{-\tau/2}/2, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})}{\gamma} \right]^{1/2}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n_0 + 1,
\end{aligned}$$

$$a_j = \frac{8n^{1/2}\delta_{n,j-1}^2}{\eta_j}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n_0.$$

Thus $\delta_{n,n_0} = \delta_{n,n_0+1} = \gamma M / (8n^{1/2})$,

$$H^B\left(\frac{\delta_{n,0}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) = \frac{\gamma\psi(M, t^2, n)}{4},$$

$$\frac{\delta_{n,0}}{2e^{\tau/2}} \leq \frac{t}{10}.$$

We observe from Lemma 3.1 of Alexander (1984) and (82) that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_0+1} \eta_j &= \frac{8}{\gamma^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_0+1} \delta_{n,j-1} \left[\sum_{i=0}^j H^B\left(\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\gamma^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_0+1} \delta_{n,j-1} \left[\frac{4}{3} H^B\left(\frac{\delta_{n,j}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \frac{8}{\gamma^{1/2}} \sum_{j=n_0}^{n_0+1} \delta_{n,j-1} \left[4 H^B\left(\frac{\delta_{n,j}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\gamma^{1/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{n_0} \delta_{n,j} \left[H^B\left(\frac{\delta_{n,j+1}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{2^7}{\gamma^{1/2}} \int_{\gamma M / (32n^{1/2})}^{\delta_{n,0}} \left[H^B\left(\frac{x}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}\right) \right]^{1/2} dx \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma M}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we observe from (80) that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{F}_{n,0}| \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r}[\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{u_0}) \geq (1 - 2^{-2}\gamma)M] \\ &\leq e^{H^B(\delta_{n,0}e^{-\tau/2}/2, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})} \exp\left\{-\frac{(1 - 2^{-2}\gamma)^2 M^2}{8[8c_0(2^{-1}e^{-\tau/2}\delta_{n,0} + t)^2 + 2n^{-1/2}(1 - 2^{-2}\gamma)M]}\right\} \\ &\leq e^{H^B(\delta_{n,0}e^{-\tau/2}/2, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})} \exp\left\{-\frac{(1 - 2^{-2}\gamma)^2 M^2}{16[8c_0t^2 + n^{-1/2}(1 - 2^{-2}\gamma)M]}\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{\left[\frac{\gamma}{4} - \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\right)^2\right]\psi(M, t^2, n)\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left[-\left(1 - \frac{3\gamma}{4}\right)\psi(M, t^2, n)\right], \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 &\leq \|u_0^{1/2} - p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2}\|_2 + \|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_{n,0}}{2e^{\tau/2}} + t \\ &\leq \frac{11t}{10}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{s,r}[(\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}})\mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}] &\leq E_{s,r}[(\tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}} - \tilde{Z}_{l_{j-1}})^2] \\ &\leq \delta_{n,j-1}^2, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n_0, \end{aligned}$$

and $-a_j \leq \tilde{Z}_{l_{j-1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}} \leq \tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}} \leq 0$ on $\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k$. Hence by the one sided version of Bernstein's inequality [see Bennett (1962), page 38],

$$P_{s,r}(\nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}})\mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}) \geq \eta_j) \leq \exp[-\frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\delta_{n,j-1}^2 + a_j \eta_j / (3n^{1/2}))}], \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n_0.$$

Since

$$\frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\delta_{n,j-1}^2 + a_j \eta_j / (3n^{1/2}))} = \frac{3\eta_j^2}{22\delta_{n,j-1}^2} \geq \frac{2}{\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^j H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{n_0} (\prod_{l=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{n,l}|) \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r}[\nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}})\mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}) \geq \eta_j] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} \exp[\sum_{i=0}^j H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) - \frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\delta_{n,j-1}^2 + a_j \eta_j / (3n^{1/2}))}] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n_0-1} \exp[-\frac{2(1-\gamma)}{\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^j H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})] \\ &\quad + \exp[-\frac{2(1-\gamma)}{\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^{n_0} H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,i}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n_0-1} \exp[-\frac{2(1-\gamma)(\sum_{i=0}^j 4^i)}{\gamma} H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,0}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})] \\ &\quad + \exp[-\frac{2(1-\gamma)(4^{n_0-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} 4^i)}{\gamma} H^B(\frac{\delta_{n,0}}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_0-1} \exp[-\frac{(1-\gamma)(\sum_{i=0}^j 4^i)}{2} \psi(M, t^2, n)] \\ &\quad + \exp[-\frac{(1-\gamma)(4^{n_0-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} 4^i)}{2} \psi(M, t^2, n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from (83) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{n_0} (\prod_{l=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{n,l}|) \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r}[\nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{u_j} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{j-1}})\mathbf{1}_{\cup_{j \leq k \leq n_0} B_k}) \geq \eta_j] \\ &\leq 2 \exp[-(1-\gamma)\psi(M, t^2, n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Next using Markov's inequality, we observe that for $0 \leq k \leq n_0 - 1$,

$$P_{s,r}(B_k) \leq P_{s,r}(\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k} \geq a_{k+1}) \leq \frac{E_{s,r}(\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k})^2}{a_{k+1}^2} \leq \frac{\delta_{n,k}^2}{a_{k+1}^2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k})\mathbf{1}_{B_k}) \\ & \leq n^{1/2} \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} E_{s,r}[(\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k})\mathbf{1}_{B_k}] \\ & \leq n^{1/2} \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} [E_{s,r}(\tilde{Z}_{u_k} - \tilde{Z}_{l_k})^2 P_{s,r}(B_k)]^{1/2} \\ & \leq \frac{n^{1/2} \delta_{n,k}^2}{a_{k+1}} \\ & = \frac{\eta_{k+1}}{8}, \quad \forall k = 0, \dots, n_0 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n_0-1} P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_k})\mathbf{1}_{B_k}) \geq \eta_{k+1} \right] = 0.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}})\mathbf{1}_{B_{n_0}}) \\ & \leq \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} n^{1/2} E_{s,r} |\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}}| \\ & \leq n^{1/2} \delta_{n,n_0} \\ & = \frac{\gamma M}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}})\mathbf{1}_{B_{n_0}}) \geq \frac{\gamma M}{8} + \eta_{n_0+1} \right] = 0.$$

Thus we conclude from (84) that

$$P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}) \geq M \right] \leq 3e^{-(1-\gamma)\psi(M,t^2,n)}.$$

CASE 2. Suppose that $\delta_{n,0} \leq \gamma M / (8n^{1/2})$. Then define $n_0 = 0$ and $\eta_1 = \gamma M / 16$. As in Case 1, we have

$$|\mathcal{F}_{n,0}| \sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} P_{s,r}[\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{u_0}) \geq (1 - \frac{\gamma}{4})M] \leq \exp[-(1 - \frac{3\gamma}{4})\psi(M,t^2,n)],$$

and

$$P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2 \leq t, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n((\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}} - \tilde{Z}_{u_{n_0}})\mathbf{1}_{B_{n_0}}) \geq \frac{\gamma M}{8} + \eta_{n_0+1} \right] = 0.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 13. $\square$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$(85) \quad 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2^7(250)}\right] \leq 1.$$

We observe that (10) holds with ε replaced by any s such that $\varepsilon \leq s \leq 1$. Let $\gamma = 1/2$, $e^{\tau/2} = 5$, $t = \sqrt{2}s$ and $M = \gamma n^{1/2}s^2/2$. Then it follows from Lemma 11 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\gamma M/(32n^{1/2})}^{e^{\tau/2}t/5} [H^B(\frac{x}{2e^{\tau/2}}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}})]^{1/2} dx &\leq \int_{s^2/2^8}^{\sqrt{2}s} [2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q} (\frac{2e^{\tau/2}}{x})^{1/q}]^{1/2} dx \\ &\leq \frac{n^{1/2}s^2}{2^{13}\sqrt{2}} \\ &= \frac{M\gamma^{3/2}}{2^{10}}, \end{aligned}$$

and since $q > 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q} (2e^{\tau/2})^{1/q}} &\leq \frac{n^{1/2}s^2}{2^{13}\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{2q-1}{2q}\right) \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2}s)^{(2q-1)/(2q)} - (2^{-3}s^2)^{(2q-1)/(2q)}} \\ &= \frac{M}{2^{11}\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{2q-1}{2q}\right) \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2}s)^{(2q-1)/(2q)} - (2^{-3}s^2)^{(2q-1)/(2q)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Also with $\psi(M, t^2, n)$ as in Lemma 13, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^B(\frac{t}{10}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}}) &\leq \frac{2^{(q+2)/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa}}^{1/q} C_{\tilde{\kappa},q} (2e^{\tau/2})^{1/q}}{(\sqrt{2}s)^{1/q}} \\ &\leq \frac{M^2}{2^{23}s^{1/q}} \left(\frac{2q-1}{2q}\right)^2 \frac{1}{[(\sqrt{2}s)^{(2q-1)/(2q)} - (2^{-3}s^2)^{(2q-1)/(2q)}]^2} \\ &\leq \frac{M^2}{2^{23}s^2} \\ &< \frac{M^2}{4s^2(64c_0 + 1)} \\ &= \frac{\gamma}{4} \psi(M, t^2, n). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we observe from Lemma 13 that

$$P_{s,r}^* \left[\sup_{\|p_{s_1,r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s,r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq 2s^2, p_{s_1,r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1,r_1}}) \geq \frac{n^{1/2}s^2}{4} \right] \leq 3 \exp\left[-\frac{ns^2}{2^7(2^6c_0 + 1)}\right].$$

Let $A = \{p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} : s^2 \leq \|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq 2s^2\}$. By Lemma 4 of Wong and Shen (1995),

$$\sup_A E(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}}) \leq -(1 - \delta)s^2,$$

where $\delta = 2e^{-\tau/2}(1 - e^{-\tau/2})^{-2} = 5/8$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_A \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s, r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \geq \exp[-ns^2(1 - \delta - \frac{1}{4})] \right\} \\ & \leq P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_A \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_{p_{s_1, r_1}}) \geq \frac{n^{1/2}s^2}{4} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_{s^2 \leq \|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq 2s^2, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s, r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-ns^2/8} \right\} \\ & \leq 3 \exp\left[-\frac{ns^2}{27(2^6 c_0 + 1)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let L be the smallest integer such that $2^L \varepsilon^2 \geq 4 \geq \max\{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 : p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s, r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/8} \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^L P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_{2^j \varepsilon^2 \leq \|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2^2 < 2^{j+1} \varepsilon^2, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s, r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/8} \right\} \\ & \leq 3 \sum_{j=0}^L \exp\left[-\frac{2^j n \varepsilon^2}{27(2^6 c_0 + 1)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude from (85) that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{s, r}^* \left\{ \sup_{\|p_{s_1, r_1}^{1/2} - p_{s, r}^{1/2}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon, p_{s_1, r_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})}{p_{s, r}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i(T)}\})} \geq e^{-n\varepsilon^2/8} \right\} \\ & \leq 4 \exp\left[-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{27(2^6 c_0 + 1)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Proposition 1. □

Lemma 14 Let $s_n^\dagger(t)$ and $r_n^\dagger(t)$ be as in (11). Then

$$E_{s, r} \left(\frac{p_{s, r}}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}} - 1 \right) \leq C_{\tilde{\kappa}, 1} \delta_n,$$

where $C_{\tilde{\kappa}, 1}$ is a constant depending only on $\tilde{\kappa}$.

PROOF. Let $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_0 \vee 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{s,r} \left(\frac{p_{s,r}}{p_{s_n^\dagger, r_n^\dagger}} - 1 \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} \frac{e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1})}{e^{-\int_0^T s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s_n^\dagger(w_i)r_n^\dagger(w_i - w_{i-1})} \\
&\quad \times [e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1}) - \\
&\quad e^{-\int_0^T s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s_n^\dagger(w_i)r_n^\dagger(w_i - w_{i-1})] dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
&\leq e^{2\bar{\kappa}^2 \delta_n (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) T} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} |e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1}) - \\
&\quad e^{-\int_0^T s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s_n^\dagger(w_i)r_n^\dagger(w_i - w_{i-1})| dw_1 \cdots dw_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we observe that

$$|s_n^\dagger(w_i)r_n^\dagger(w_i - w_{i-1}) - s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1})| \leq 2\bar{\kappa}^2 \delta_n (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& |e^{-\int_0^T s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} - e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt}| \\
&\leq |1 - e^{\int_0^T [s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)}) - s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})]dt}| \\
&\leq 2\bar{\kappa}^2 \delta_n (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) T \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{[2\bar{\kappa}^2 \delta_n (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) T]^i}{(i+1)!}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for $j = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} |e^{-\int_0^T s(t)r(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s(w_i)r(w_i - w_{i-1}) - \\
& e^{-\int_0^T s_n^\dagger(t)r_n^\dagger(t-w_{\zeta(t)})dt} \prod_{i=1}^j s_n^\dagger(w_i)r_n^\dagger(w_i - w_{i-1})| dw_1 \cdots dw_j \\
&\leq \delta_n \left\{ 2\bar{\kappa}^{4j+2} (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) T \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{[2\bar{\kappa}^2 (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) T]^i}{(i+1)!} + 2j\bar{\kappa}^{4j-2} (2\bar{\kappa} + \delta_n) \right\} \frac{T^j}{j!}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Lemma 14. $\square$

Lemma 15 Let $N(t), t \in [0, T]$, be a counting process with conditional intensity $\lambda_1(\cdot|.)$ as in (1). Suppose that (12) holds and

$$(86) \quad \xi(t) := \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} P_{s,r}[N(t+\delta) - N(t) = 1], \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Then for $s_1, r_1 \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ &= \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} \right] \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \\ & \quad + \int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)r_1(u)}{s(t)r(u)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{s_1(t)r_1(u)}{s(t)r(u)} \right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v)r(v-t+u) dv} dudt. \end{aligned}$$

Also if

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \leq 1,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ & \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \left[\int_0^T |s_1(t) - s(t)| e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ & \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v)r(v-t+u) dv} dudt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \\ & \quad \times \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t |s_1(t)r_1(u) - s(t)r(u)| \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v)r(v-t+u) dv} dudt \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Writing the expectation as a Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral [cf. Aalen (1978) and Karr (1987); see also Miller (1985), page 1455, for a different approach], we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})} \right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \\ &= E_{s,r} \log \left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{N(T)}\})} \right] \\ &= E_{s,r} \left\{ - \int_0^T s(t) r(t - w_{N(t)}) dt + \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \log [s(w_j) r(w_j - w_{j-1})] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^T s_1(t) r_1(t - w_{N(t)}) dt - \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \log [s_1(w_j) r_1(w_j - w_{j-1})] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= - \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt + \int_0^T \log[s(t)] e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} s(t) dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_0^t s(t) r(u) \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^t \log[s(t) r(u)] \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} s(t) r(u) du dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T s_1(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt - \int_0^T \log[s_1(t)] e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} s(t) dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^t s_1(t) r_1(u) \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_0^t \log[s_1(t) r_1(u)] \xi(t-u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} s(t) r(u) du dt \\
&= \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 - \log\left[\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)}\right] \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{s_1(t) r_1(u)}{s(t) r(u)} - 1 - \log\left[\frac{s_1(t) r_1(u)}{s(t) r(u)}\right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Next suppose that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n_\theta} \int_{0 < w_1 < \dots < w_j < T} p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\}) \log\left[\frac{p_{s,r}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_1, \dots, w_j\})}\right] dw_1 \dots dw_j \leq 1.$$

Since $y - 1 - \log(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in [0, \infty)$ with equality only if $y = 1$, we conclude that

$$(87) \quad \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 - \log\left[\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)}\right] \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \leq 1,$$

and

$$\int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{s_1(t) r_1(u)}{s(t) r(u)} - 1 - \log\left[\frac{s_1(t) r_1(u)}{s(t) r(u)}\right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt \leq 1.$$

Observing that

$$y - 1 - \log(y) \geq \frac{(y-1)^2}{10} \mathbf{1}\{y \in (0, 6)\} + \frac{y-1}{10} \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 6\},$$

it follows from (87) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 - \log\left[\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)}\right] \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \\
&\geq \frac{1}{10} \int_0^T \left(\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 \right)^2 \mathbf{1}\left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} \in (0, 6) \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{10} \int_0^T \left(\frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} \geq 6 \right\} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{1}{10 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt} \left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 \right| \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} \in (0, 6) \right\}} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right]^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{100} \left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 \right| \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} \geq 6 \right\}} s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right]^2 \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \left[\int_0^T \left| \frac{s_1(t)}{s(t)} - 1 \right| s(t) e^{-\int_0^t s(u) du} dt \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{s_1(t)r_1(u)}{s(t)r(u)} - 1 - \log \left[\frac{s_1(t)r_1(u)}{s(t)r(u)} \right] \right\} \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{20 \int_0^T \int_0^t \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt}, \frac{1}{200} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t \left| \frac{s_1(t)r_1(u)}{s(t)r(u)} - 1 \right| \xi(t-u) s(t) r(u) e^{-\int_{t-u}^t s(v) r(v-t+u) dv} du dt \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Lemma 15. □

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. Following Yatracos (1988), page 1183, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup \{ E_{s,r} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s(t)| dt \right] : s \in \Theta_{\tilde{\kappa},q}, r \in \Theta_{\theta,\tilde{\kappa},q} \} \\
&\geq \sup \{ E_{s_1,r_1} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt \right] : s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n} \} \\
(88) \quad &\geq \frac{1}{\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n})} \sum_{s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} E_{s_1,r_1} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt \right],
\end{aligned}$$

for any $r_1 \in \Theta_{\theta,\tilde{\kappa},q}$. Define $\tilde{s}_n^* \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$ such that

$$\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - \tilde{s}_n^*(t)| dt = \inf \left\{ \int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt : s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n} \right\}.$$

Then we have for $s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n^*(t) - s_1(t)| dt &\leq \int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n^*(t) - \tilde{s}_n(t)| dt + \int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt \\
&\leq 2 \int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n})} \sum_{s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} E_{s_1,r_1} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n(t) - s_1(t)| dt \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2 \text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n})} \sum_{s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa},q,n}} E_{s_1,r_1} \left[\int_0^T |\tilde{s}_n^*(t) - s_1(t)| dt \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \inf \left\{ \int_0^T |s_1(t) - s_2(t)| dt : s_1 \neq s_2, s_1, s_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n} \right\} \\
(89) \quad &\times \frac{1}{2 \text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n})} \sum_{s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} P_{s_1, r_1}(\tilde{s}_n^* \neq s_1).
\end{aligned}$$

We observe from Fano's lemma [cf. Ibragimov and Has'minskii (1981), pages 323 to 325, or Yatracos (1988), page 1182] that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n})} \sum_{s_1 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} P_{s_1, r_1}(\tilde{s}_n^* \neq s_1) \\
(90) \quad &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\log[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}) - 1]} \left\{ \log 2 + \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{[\text{card}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n})]^2} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{\kappa}, q, n}} E_{s_1, r_1} \log \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{s_1, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i}(T)\})}{p_{s_2, r_1}(\{w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i, N_i}(T)\})} \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

(15) now follows from (88), (89) and (90). (16) is proved in a similar manner. $\square$

9 Appendix B

PROOF OF (48). Let $u = \delta T^{-1/2}$ for some $0 < \delta < \kappa$. The contribution to $C_{\mathbf{w}, u}$ from (44) is equal to (under $P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&-T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{y \in \mathbf{y}^{(i)}} \frac{d^2}{dv^2} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v=y} + o(1) \\
(91) \quad &= -T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^T \left[\frac{d^2}{dv^2} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \right] e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)} dv + o(1) \quad \text{a.s. as } T \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\frac{d^2}{dv^2} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)$ exists for all v in an interval (v_0, v_1) , then by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{v_0}^{v_1} \left[\frac{d^2}{dv^2} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \right] e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)} dv \\
(92) \quad &= -\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)} \Big|_{v=v_0}^{v=v_1} + \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \int_{v_0}^{v_1} \left[\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \right]^2 e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v)} dv.
\end{aligned}$$

By letting $v_1 \uparrow h_{j+1}$ and $v_0 \downarrow h_j$, where h_j and h_{j+1} are adjacent points in H_i , it follows from (92) that (91) is equal to

$$(93) \quad T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{h \in H_i} \left(\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \downarrow h} - \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \uparrow h} \right) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(h)} + \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}} + o(1).$$

By the law of large numbers, the contribution to $C_{\mathbf{w}, u}$ from (45) is equal to

$$(94) \quad \frac{2}{u^2 T} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{h \in H_i} \left[\int_h^{h+u} (h+u-y) dy \right] \left(\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \uparrow h} - \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \downarrow h} \right) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(h)} + o(1)$$

$$= T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \sum_{h \in H_i} \left(\frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \uparrow h} - \frac{d}{dv} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(v) \Big|_{v \downarrow h} \right) e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}} g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(h)} + o(1)$$

almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Since the contribution from (46) to $C_{\mathbf{w},u}$ is asymptotically negligible, it follows from adding up (93) and (94) that

$$(95) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [C_{\mathbf{w},u} - \theta_{\mathbf{w}} \tau_{\mathbf{w}}] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s. under } P_{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}}.$$

Since the first and second derivatives of $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ are bounded and continuous by (A2), it follows from (47) that there exists $\beta_s \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$(96) \quad \sup_{u \leq x \leq u+sT^{-1/2}} T |u^2 C_{\mathbf{w},u} - x^2 C_{\mathbf{w},x}| \leq \beta_s$$

for all large T with probability 1. We can conclude (48) from (95) and (96). $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 6. By stationarity, we may assume without loss of generality $t = 0$. Let $\ell \geq 1$ and let us denote by Q_{θ} ($= Q_{\theta,\ell}$) the probability measure under which $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ is generated as a Poisson point process on $[0, T + \ell \kappa T^{-1/2})$ with intensity

$$\eta_i(u) = \lambda_i \exp[\theta \tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)] \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d,$$

where $\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) = g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u) + g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u - \ell \kappa T^{-1/2})$. Let

$$(97) \quad \tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{w}}(c) = \sup_{\theta > 0} \left[2\theta c - T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^{T+\ell \kappa T^{-1/2}} (e^{\theta \tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} - 1) du \right]$$

and let $\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}} > 0$ attain the supremum on the right hand side of (97). Define $\tilde{S}_x = S_x + S_{x+\ell \kappa T^{-1/2}}$. It follows from the arguments in (36), (41) and (42) that

$$E_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}}[\tilde{S}_0] = 2c, \quad E_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}} \left[\frac{d}{dx} \tilde{S}_x \Big|_{x=0} \right] = O(T^{-1}),$$

where $E_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}}$ denotes expectation with respect to $Q_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}}$, and

$$\text{Cov}_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{S}_0 \\ \frac{d}{dx} \tilde{S}_x \Big|_{x=0} \end{pmatrix} \right) \sim T^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{w}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{w}}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{w}}$ are defined as in (26) but with $\int_0^{T+\ell \kappa T^{-1/2}}$ replacing $\int_0^T$, $\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ replacing $g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}$ replacing $\theta_{\mathbf{w}}$. Hence for intervals $I_{1,T}$, $I_{2,T}$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_{\tilde{\theta}_{\mathbf{w}}} \left\{ T^{1/2} \left(\tilde{S}_0 - 2c, \frac{d}{dx} \tilde{S}_x \Big|_{x=0} \right) \in I_{1,T} \times I_{2,T} \right\} \\ & \sim (2\pi)^{-1} (\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{w}})^{-1/2} \left(\int_{z_1 \in I_{1,T}} e^{-z_1^2/(2\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_1 \right) \left(\int_{z_2 \in I_{2,T}} e^{-z_2^2/(2\tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{w}})} dz_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the arguments in the proof of Lemma 5, it follows that analogous to (43),

$$P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_0 \cap A_{\ell \kappa T^{-1/2}}) \leq P_{\mathbf{w}} \left\{ \sup_{0 < u < \kappa T^{-1/2}} \tilde{S}_u \geq \max(2c, \tilde{S}_0, \tilde{S}_{\kappa T^{-1/2}}) \right\}$$

$$(98) \quad \sim \kappa T^{-1/2} \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathbf{w}} e^{-T\tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{w}}(c)},$$

for all ℓ and large T , where $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathbf{w}} = (2\pi)^{-1}(\tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{w}}/\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{w}})^{1/2}$. It remains for us to show that there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that with probability 1,

$$(99) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{w}}(c) &\geq \theta_{\mathbf{w}}c - T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^{\ell\kappa T^{-1/2}+T} (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)/2} - 1) du \\ &\geq \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) + \gamma \min\{\ell^2\kappa^2T^{-1}, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq \ell \leq T^{3/2}/\kappa + 1$ and T large, so that (49) follows by adding up (98) over $1 \leq \ell \leq T^{3/2}/\kappa + 1$.

The first inequality in (99) follows directly from letting $\theta = \theta_{\mathbf{w}}/2$ in the right hand side of (97). By the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &2e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}[g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)+g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-\ell\kappa T^{-1/2})]/2} \\ &= e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)} + e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-\ell\kappa T^{-1/2})} - (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)/2} - e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-\ell\kappa T^{-1/2})/2})^2, \end{aligned}$$

it follows from (23) that

$$(100) \quad \begin{aligned} &\theta_{\mathbf{w}}c - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^{\ell\kappa T^{-1/2}+T} (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)/2} - 1) du \\ &= \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) + \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \int_0^{\ell\kappa T^{-1/2}+T} (e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u)/2} - e^{\theta_{\mathbf{w}}g_{\mathbf{w}}^{(i)}(u-\ell\kappa T^{-1/2})/2})^2 du \end{aligned}$$

and the second inequality of (99) indeed holds for all large T with probability 1. $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 9. The proof of Lemma 9 uses arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 6. The main changes are in replacing $\kappa T^{-1/2}$ by κT^{-1} . Analogous to (98), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that with probability 1,

$$(101) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{\mathbf{w}}(A_t \cap A_{t+\ell\kappa T^{-1}}) &\leq P_{\mathbf{w}}\left\{S_t + S_{t+\ell\kappa T^{-1}} < 2c, \sup_{t < u \leq t+\kappa T^{-1}} (S_u + S_{u+\ell\kappa T^{-1}}) \geq 2c\right\} \\ &\leq C\kappa T^{-1/2} e^{-T\tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{w}}(c)} \end{aligned}$$

for all large T , if κ is chosen large enough. By (100) (with $\kappa T^{-1/2}$ replaced by κT^{-1}), the following analogue to (99),

$$(102) \quad \tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{w}}(c) \geq \phi_{\mathbf{w}}(c) + \gamma \min\{\ell\kappa T^{-1}, 1\}$$

holds with probability 1 for some $\gamma > 0$ and hence Lemma 9 follows from (101) and (102). $\square$

References

- [1] AALEN, O. (1978). Nonparametric inference for a family of counting processes. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 701-726.

- [2] ALEXANDER, K. S. (1984). Probability inequalities for empirical processes and a law of the iterated logarithm. *Ann. Probab.* **12** 1041-1067.
- [3] BENNETT, G. (1962). Probability inequalities for the sum of independent random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **57** 33-45.
- [4] BERRY, M. J. and MEISTER, M. (1998). Refractoriness and neural precision. *J. Neurosci.* **18** 2200-2211.
- [5] BIRGÉ, L. (1983). Approximation dans les espaces métriques et théorie de l'estimation. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **65** 181-237.
- [6] BRILLINGER, D. R. (1992). Nerve cell spike train data analysis: a progression of technique. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **87** 260-271.
- [7] BROWN, E. N., KASS, R. E. and MITRA, P. P. (2004). Multiple neural spike train data analysis: state-of-the-art and future challenges. *Nature Neurosci.* **7** 456-461.
- [8] CHAN, H. P. (2003). Upper bounds and importance sampling of p -values for DNA and protein sequence alignments. *Bernoulli* **9** 183-199.
- [9] CHI, Z. (2004). Large deviations for template matching between point processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **15** 153-174.
- [10] CHI, Z., RAUSKE, P. L. and MARGOLIASH, D. (2003). Pattern filtering for detection of neural activity, with examples from HVC activity during sleep in zebra finches. *Neural Comput.* **15** 2307-2337.
- [11] DALEY, D. J. and VERE-JONES, D. (2002). *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes, Vol. I: Elementary Theory and Methods*, 2nd edition. Springer, New York.
- [12] DAVE, A. S. and MARGOLIASH, D. (2000). Song replay during sleep and computational rules for sensorimotor vocal learning. *Science* **290** 812-816.
- [13] DAYAN, P. and ABBOTT, L. F. (2001). *Theoretical Neuroscience: Computational and Mathematical Modeling of Neural Systems*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [14] DAYHOFF, J. E. and GERSTEIN, G. L. (1983). Favored patterns in spike trains. I. Detection. *J. Neurophysiol.* **49** 1334-1348.
- [15] DUDLEY, R. M. (1999). *Uniform Central Limit Theorems*. Cambridge Univ. Press, New York.
- [16] FELLER, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol II*, 2nd edition. Wiley, New York.
- [17] GRÜN, S., DIESMANN, M. and AERTSEN, A. (2002). Unitary events in multiple single-neuron spiking activity: I. Detection and significance. *Neural Comput.* **14** 43-80.
- [18] IBRAGIMOV, I. A. and HAS'MINSKII, R. Z. (1981). *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer, New York.

- [19] JOHNSON, D. H. and SWAMI, A. (1983). The transmission of signals by auditory-nerve fiber discharge patterns. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **74** 493-501.
- [20] KARR, A. F. (1987). Maximum likelihood estimation in the multiplicative intensity model via sieves. *Ann. Statist.* **15** 473-490.
- [21] KASS, R. E. and VENTURA, V. (2001). A spike-train probability model. *Neural Comput.* **13** 1713-1720.
- [22] KOLMOGOROV, A. N. and TIHOMIROV, V. M. (1959). ε -entropy and ε -capacity of sets in function spaces. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **14** 3-86 [in Russian; English transl. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2* **17** 277-364 (1961)].
- [23] LAI, T. L. and SHAN, Z. (1999). Efficient recursive algorithm for detection of abrupt changes in signal and control systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **44** 952-966.
- [24] MILLER, M. I. (1985). Algorithms for removing recovery-related distortion from auditory-nerve discharge patterns. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **77** 1452-1464.
- [25] MOONEY, R. (2000). Different subthreshold mechanisms underlie song selectivity in identified HVc neurons of the zebra finch. *J. Neurosci.* **20** 5420-5436.
- [26] NÁDASDY, Z., HIRASE, H., CZURKÓ, A., CSICSVARI, J. and BUZSÁKI, G. (1999). Replay and time compression of recurring spike sequences in the hippocampus. *J. Neurosci.* **19** 9497-9509.
- [27] OSSIANDER, M. (1987). A central limit theorem under metric entropy with L_2 bracketing. *Ann. Probab.* **15** 897-919.
- [28] SHEN, X. and WONG, W. H. (1994). Convergence rate of sieve estimates. *Ann. Statist.* **22** 580-615.
- [29] SIEGMUND, D. (1976). Importance sampling in the Monte Carlo study of sequential tests. *Ann. Statist.* **4** 673-684.
- [30] SIEGMUND, D. (1985). *Sequential Analysis*. Springer, New York.
- [31] STONE, C. (1965). A local limit theorem for nonlattice multi-dimensional distribution functions. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **36** 546-551.
- [32] VENTURA, V., CARTA, R., KASS, R. E., GETTNER, S. N. and OLSON, C. R. (2002). Statistical analysis of temporal evolution in single-neuron firing rates. *Biostatistics* **3** 1-20.
- [33] WONG, W. H. and SHEN, X. (1995). Probability inequalities for likelihood ratios and convergence rates of sieve mles. *Ann. Statist.* **23** 339-362.
- [34] YATRACOS, Y. (1988). A lower bound on the error in nonparametric regression type problems. *Ann. Statist.* **16** 1180-1187.